

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XXXIX, No. 1009

October 27, 1958

**THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA: CHALLENGE
AND OPPORTUNITY** • *by Assistant Secretary
Satterthwaite* 641

**DATE SET FOR TECHNICAL TALKS ON PREVENT-
ING SURPRISE ATTACK** • *Exchange of Notes Between
U.S. and U.S.S.R.* 648

**DEVELOPING UNIVERSAL RESPECT FOR THE RULE
OF LAW** • *Remarks by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy* . 651

**COMPONENTS OF INTER-AMERICAN UNDERSTAND-
ING** • *by Assistant Secretary Rubottom* 654

**U.N. COMMITTEE AGREES ON PROCEDURE FOR
DISARMAMENT ITEMS** • *Statements by Ambassador
Henry Cabot Lodge* 666

**INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN FIELD OF
ATOMIC ENERGY** • *Remarks by John A. McCone* . . 668

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXIX, No. 1009 • PUBLICATION 6718

October 27, 1958

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The United States and Africa: Challenge and Opportunity

by Joseph C. Satterthwaite
*Assistant Secretary for African Affairs*¹

Since last May, when the American Assembly held its seminar at Arden House, much has happened on the African scene. In fact the available topics one might consider are too numerous to consider adequately in a single talk. Consequently I shall limit my discourse tonight to sketching the current status of African nationalism, Africa's struggle for economic development, and our policies relating to these two basic topics.

The Status of Nationalism in Africa Today

As has been said again and again, the urge to create a national entity and to exercise the prerogatives of self-government is clearly the major political, social, and economic force at work in most of Africa today. This great drive—this dynamic force of nationalism—is weaving profound changes in the pattern of African society and is of direct and fundamental importance, first, to Europe and, of course, to the United States, the Americas, and Asia.

Political observers predict that within the next few years nearly 75 percent of the 140 million Africans still living in dependent territories will be governing themselves. Yet this great sociopolitical drama is taking place largely without the glare of publicity, for the spotlight of world attention is focused on more spectacular developments in the Near and Far East.

African nationalism, like the continent itself, is diverse. We cannot therefore expect to find many generalizations that will clearly interpret all the national dramas unfolding on this great conti-

nent. Let us, then, survey some recent developments there and analyze their significance.

In northwest Africa, for example, dynamic nationalism is expressing itself among the independent states in strenuous efforts to realize a fuller sense of independence and complete sovereignty—in a word, to consolidate the gains of the last few years.

In the continent's oldest independent states, Ethiopia and Liberia, the prevailing spirit today can be described as that of awakening fervor, a growing sense of belonging to a new Africa on the move, and an increasing desire for national progress on all fronts—social, economic, and political.

In vast sub-Sahara Africa the trend is toward regional cooperation in quest of a greater unity of purpose in the nationalist movement, which, however, has still not reached every territory in the region.

The first conference of independent African states was held at Accra last April 15 to 22 on the invitation of Prime Minister Nkrumah. This conference made clear that a major objective of the eight independent states of Africa participating is the rapid end of the continent's colonial system and the strengthening of their own independence.

Perhaps the most ambitious effort since World War II to revitalize the pan-African movement will be the All-African Peoples Conference, which has been called by the Convention Peoples Party of Ghana to convene in Accra from December 5 to 12 of this year. Its sponsors report they are inviting all known African political par-

¹ Address made before the Western Regional Assembly (University of California at Los Angeles) at Lake Arrowhead, Calif., on Oct. 9 (press release 590 dated Oct. 8).

ties to attend. About 60 such parties and organizations from countries and territories throughout the continent are already associated with the project, and the sponsors hope to have delegates from 100 organizations on hand by the time the conference convenes.

The main purpose of this assemblage, in the words of its hosts, is

... to formulate concrete plans and work out the Gandhian tactics and strategy of the African non-violent revolution in relation to colonialism and imperialism; racialism and discriminatory laws and practices; tribalism and religious separatism; and the position of chieftaincy under colonial rule and under a democratic society.

The United States will not be alone in watching with great interest the outcome of this conference.

It is clear that the majority of Africans today are seeking political unity of purpose, energy, and endeavor. The evolving European Community and other European efforts to achieve unity are in themselves examples for such endeavor. We may ask, then, where are the militant forces of nationalism leading Africa?

To answer this question, we need first to examine African objectives as stated by the continent's leaders themselves.

For example, Prime Minister Nkrumah of Ghana wrote in an article entitled "African Prospect" in the October issue of *Foreign Affairs* that, despite the diversity of Africa and the divergences, differences, and varying points of emphasis one finds in the continent, there are currently three traits common to all Africa. In his own words these are:

1. Our desire to see Africa free and independent.
2. Our determination to pursue foreign policies based upon non-alignment.
3. Our urgent need for economic development.

In short, responsible and articulate Africans today seek equality, dignity, and justice for themselves and their fellow countrymen. They seek to bridge as rapidly as possible the great gulf between conditions on their continent and in the Western World. They are clearly determined to eliminate old-fashioned colonialism and racial discrimination from the African Continent. They seek to play an important and expanding role in world affairs—to project the new "African personality" on the world scene. As indicated by the

various all-African conferences to which I have just referred, they seek to gain their objectives by achieving a greater unity of purpose among their diverse and disparate peoples.

What should the United States attitude toward these African nationalist objectives be?

Insofar as these objectives are progressive, just, and constructive, insofar as the methods employed to achieve the objectives are nonviolent and equitable, our attitude—in accordance with our national history, character, and tradition—should obviously be one of sympathy and support.

Secretary Dulles in his personal message to Prime Minister Nkrumah delivered at the opening of the Accra conference of independent states last April,² declared:

Through you, I wish to assure the African nations that they can count on the sympathetic interest of the people and Government of the United States. The United States will continue to stand ready to support the constructive efforts of the states of Africa to achieve a stable, prosperous community, conscious of its interdependence within the family of nations and dedicated to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

What should be our policy toward the diverse dependent territories now emerging toward varying forms of self-government and aspiring for independence?

Having long recognized that traditional colonialism is coming to an end, the United States supports the principle of orderly transition to self-government and eventual self-determination in the interests of all parties and peoples involved. The speed of this evolution, we believe, should be determined by the capacity of the African populations concerned to assume and discharge the responsibilities of self-government.

The United States supports European measures designed to provide self-government and eventual autonomy to dependent African territories. Insofar as we are able to do so, we also encourage moderate African leaders who recognize the benefit to their own people of evolutionary rather than revolutionary progress. In this connection the United States believes that all concerned should consider seriously the dangerous pitfalls that confront a newly independent state today. Economic viability, established and stable political, social, and cultural institutions, trained cadres of civil servants, and at least a modicum of experienced

² BULLETIN of May 12, 1958, p. 765.

technicians are generally regarded as essential to a modern nation.

I should also like to point out that many Africans now look with gratitude and appreciation on their associations with the European powers, and we believe that the time may well come when most Africans will do so. For it is these powers which have brought Africa advanced administrative techniques, modern economic-development methods, needed public-health and educational measures, and great capital investment and construction.

The U.N. Trusteeship System

And speaking of constructive assistance in development, let us turn now to a consideration of one of the most important systems for political advancement in operation on the African Continent, the United Nations trusteeship system, which is designed to bring about "independence by orderly evolution."

This system is responsible for six trust territories: French Togo, British and French Cameroons, Ruanda-Urundi, Tanganyika, and Somalia. A seventh territory—British Togo—joined the newly independent state of Ghana in March of 1957 in accordance with the will of the Togo population expressed in a popular plebiscite supervised by the United Nations.

Provision is made under this system for periodic visiting missions to the territories under trusteeship and also for hearing petitioners in person at sessions of the Trusteeship Council and the United Nations General Assembly.

A U.N. Trusteeship Council visiting mission will leave later this month for the British and French Cameroons, under the chairmanship of Mr. Benjamin Gerig of the United States. Representatives from Haiti, India, and New Zealand complete the mission, which has been requested to include in its report on the British Cameroons its views on the methods of consultation which should be adopted when the time comes for the people to express their wishes concerning their future. The mission will subsequently also examine conditions in French Cameroun, where important constitutional advances have been made in the past 2 years.

We are encouraged by a recent statement from French official sources to the effect that agreement

has been reached between the French and Togo governments on plans which it is hoped will result in independence for Togo within the framework of the U.N. Charter. Progress is also being made toward this same objective in negotiations between the French and Cameroun governments, an agreement having been drafted which now awaits approval of the two governments.

In accordance with the trusteeship agreement entered into by Italy and the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1950, the Trust Territory of Somaliland under Italian administration is scheduled to become the independent state of Somalia in 1960. Elections will probably be held early next year for a new legislative assembly which will be authorized to prepare the constitution for the new state. Although Somalia is faced with a large budgetary deficit and has a disputed border with Ethiopia, there is no reason to doubt that the orderly transition of this country to full independence will unfold as expected. The Trusteeship Council is concerned with exploring the possibilities of providing the necessary economic assistance when independence is achieved, and the disputed border problem has been submitted to arbitration.

Tanganyika, a British East African trust territory, the largest and most populous of all African trust territories, held its first national elections in 5 of its 10 electoral districts last month. It will hold elections in the remaining 5 districts next spring to complete its new 67-member Legislative Council. The Council is formed on the multi-racial principle, with representatives from the African, Indian, and European communities. These elections have been held on the basis of a common roll, with each voter voting for three candidates—one each from the African, Asian, and European communities.

Following completion of these elections next year, the Constitutional Committee of the Tanganyika Legislative Council will be established to consider further constitutional steps to take, such as a review of the parity system of equal communal representation and of the possibility of increasing African representation on the Council. The Trusteeship Council at its 21st session this spring expressed the hope that the Tanganyika government would review its national electoral qualifications with a view to introducing universal suffrage with the least possible delay.

A 1957 visiting mission to the Belgian Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi reported that that territory was making encouraging progress toward the goals of the trusteeship system. Steps are being taken to eliminate the remaining vestiges of feudalistic society and to install institutions more in keeping with the principles of modern democracy; public opinion is making a greater effort to express itself, and the ultimate development of Ruanda-Urundi into a modern African state can now be envisaged.

Reviewing the progress of trust areas toward self-government or independence over the past 10 years, I believe we can fairly conclude that these areas are not only keeping pace with the non-trust territories emerging into independent states in Africa but will develop toward fuller autonomy at least as well-organized and experienced as those areas which have not had the benefits of the trusteeship system.

The United States is proud of the role it has played in the trusteeship process and will continue, where appropriate, to assist those African leaders who, during the trusteeship period, have sought to bring their countries into independence through the full exercise of democratic principles and practices.

Before I turn to other aspects of African nationalist development, I feel that I also should mention the constructive work of a less publicized and nonpermanent United Nations body that has concerned itself with conditions in African dependent areas—the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United Nations, of course, has no responsibility for the supervision of dependent areas other than trust territories. However, all governments having dependent territories are obligated by the charter of the United Nations to report regularly to the United Nations on the economic, social, and educational conditions in these areas.

The 14-member Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, of which the United States has been a member since its inception, was created by the United Nations to review these reports and to make general recommendations on economic, social, and educational conditions. These recommendations can be very useful to governments which are engaged in promoting the orderly social and political evolution of the dependent territories under their jurisdiction.

Turning to developments in other parts of

Africa, our attention first logically focuses on the recent constitutional referendum held in the 14 African territories of France (including Madagascar) on September 28. This single, dramatic action was one of the most significant and far-reaching developments in the political evolution of Africa this year and should result in a new and mutually beneficial association between France and French African territories.

As a result of this election, held on the basis of universal suffrage for all over 21, the territory of French Guinea, which voted in favor of its independence, is taking steps to withdraw from the French West African Federation. The 13 other African territories of France will presumably be organized into the new French Community within the next 6 months. Each territory will apparently have full local autonomy. Matters common to members of the Community, such as defense, foreign relations, and currency, will be handled by special federal institutions in which the French Government will have the dominant voice.

The executive of the new Community will be the President of the French Republic, assisted by a government composed of the French and territorial premiers and French ministers dealing with matters of community interest. A senate and a court of arbitration to settle disputes between territories are also provided.

According to the constitution, those territories which choose to join the Community may subsequently leave it and become independent. This independence, however, is to be negotiated between the territory and metropolitan France. It is hoped that a continuing close and profitable relationship will be maintained between France and these areas.

Developments in British African territories are equally encouraging. Forty-five delegates from Nigeria are currently holding a constitutional conference in London to determine the steps to be taken to lead the giant West African Federation of some 35 million people to independence in 1960. The conferees are struggling to settle such problems as the question of creating new states within the Federation, which now is divided into three large regions, the problem of the allocation of revenues between the regional and federal governments, the control of police, and electoral laws. In 1957, at another constitutional conference held in London, the Eastern and Western Regions re-

quested internal self-government and have since achieved it. The Northern Region—the most populous and predominantly Muslim—wants self-government by March of 1959, and the southern Cameroons, a British trust territory which is represented in the federal Nigerian government, seeks internal self-government by October 1959.

Next year federal elections will be held throughout Nigeria, and the new House of Assembly will be asked to approve a motion formally requesting the British to grant independence to the Federation in 1960. Great Britain indicated last year that it would receive such a resolution sympathetically and be prepared to fix the date for ending the colonial rule which began about 100 years ago.

British Sierra Leone in west Africa and Uganda in east Africa are also making important strides toward autonomy and self-government. Kenya has held elections to fill the larger representation accorded Africans in the Legislative Council. Pressure for still greater African participation in the multiracial crown colony's government continues very strong, however.

The Search for a Just Racial Policy

The major political problem of east and central Africa, of course, is that of working out equitable policies to govern relations between the many races living side by side there.

Prime Minister Sir Roy Welensky of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, in an article in the October edition of *Western World* published in Paris on September 24, said:

It is my firm belief that the regime of friendship, of cooperation between the races which we endeavor to practice in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, does the most for the people of Africa.

The Federation, in effect, hopes to settle the race problem through a policy of racial partnership.

On the other hand, in such regions as west Africa, where white settlers are few or come almost exclusively as missionaries, traders, teachers, administrators, or technicians, racial problems have been relatively minor.

One can conclude then that contact between Africans and Europeans alone does not give rise to serious race problems, but social and economic competition between two permanently established racial groups—such as in settler areas—does seem to do so. The problem resolves essentially around the African aspiration to approximate more

nearly the higher European living standard and to increase his share of his country's great natural resources and production.

Although we cannot ignore the many dangers inherent in any failure to meet the problem of harmonious relationships between the several races inhabiting Africa's dependent and independent territories, we must recognize that at the present time—in view of our own domestic problems—we must in humility avoid proposing specific solutions. We can and must, however, continue to stand steadfastly for the universal principle of nondiscrimination and racial equality.

Insofar as we are able to solve this knotty problem of harmonious race relationships within our own borders we will be in a better moral position to exercise greater influence for moderate solutions of racial problems in Africa and elsewhere in the world.

Alien Pressures: Communism

In addition to the disturbing influence of racial friction, the nationalist movement in Africa is further harassed by the machinations of international communism, forever seeking to turn fluid situations to advantage for the Communist bloc.

At the Cairo Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference held last December and January, the Communists notified the world that Africa was to be the next arena of their anticolonial subversion.

In recent months the Communists have vigorously continued their work of penetrating individual African labor organizations, youth groups, and nationalist organizations. They continue working overtime in Egypt and western Europe to influence the thousands of African students now studying there, bringing many either to bloc countries or the Soviet Union on scholarships or "guided" tours. They are devoting greatly increased study and research to African subjects and training more specialists in African affairs both in the Soviet Union and its satellites. In the last 2 years they have signed trade agreements with most of the independent African states. They are pressing to exchange diplomatic representatives with those independent states with which they have not yet done so.

Although the current Soviet economic, cultural, and diplomatic offensive has not shown important results in Africa, no one can afford to be complacent. Persistent and ingenious Communists,

skilled in subversive and revolutionary tactics, must be reckoned with. Success in meeting the Communist challenge in Africa will directly depend on success in helping Africans realize their legitimate political and economic aspirations in a progressive manner.

The Struggle for Economic Development

Africa's economic and social needs, closely related to her political and racial problems, are numerous and pressing. Among them are the need for more public and private capital for investment and development; for more technical, executive, and organizational skills and abilities; for more transportation and communication facilities; and for diversification of one-crop economies.

Constituting a major challenge to our wisdom, good will, and generosity, these economic problems require prompt remedial action. They are so numerous that no one nation can possibly solve them alone. Africa must have and deserves the cooperative support of all nations of the free world in this endeavor. Much is already being done.

The United Nations is contributing in numerous ways to assisting Africa's development. One-sixth of all loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development since 1951 have gone to African states and territories. Mr. Eugene R. Black, bank president, estimates that the International Bank's lending in Africa this year will be approximately \$100 million. He has indicated, further, that he foresees a growing amount of bank activity there. The United States, it should be stressed, contributes at least 40 percent of the funds of the bank. The Soviet Union, it is equally important to note, is not even a member.

The United Nations Technical Assistance Program has been devoting more than \$3 million annually to African development and is expected to expand this sum considerably in the years ahead.

This spring the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations created a new Economic Commission for Africa, which will establish its headquarters in Addis Ababa. The first session of this body will be held in December of this year. The United States is not a member of the Commission but will be represented by observers at its opening session.

We believe this new United Nations organ will be able to bring into focus Africa's many economic problems as well as its opportunities. It will be in a position to help the states of Africa find effective answers to their problems. It will also provide a forum for a broad exchange of views and ideas as well as for the more detailed consideration of future plans and new techniques for accelerating African economic development.

Side by side with economic development, of course, must come social progress. Both the United Nations and the countries of the free world must contribute to Africa's social advancement, for the advancement of African agriculture and its progress in industrialization must take into account available human resources and the social patterns within which economic development takes place. This is particularly true since social patterns in Africa range from primitive tribal organizations to highly developed urban societies.

In this connection we can note happily the important contributions to African social as well as economic development of the United Nations technical agencies—the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the International Labor Organization (ILO), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The newly created Economic Commission for Africa will also consider social questions insofar as they are related to economic development.

United States and European private investments are of growing significance to African economic development. Our investment in the continent now totals about \$624 million, one-half of which is in the Union of South Africa. European investment is many times that sum. European governments are expending between \$600 and \$700 million annually in African areas, principally for economic assistance to their dependent territories.

The United States reciprocal trade agreement and mutual security programs, which have been in effect for some years now, demonstrate clear recognition of our interdependence and mutuality of interest with other nations of the free world, including the African nations. For the last 2 fiscal years, the mutual security program alone has provided more than \$70 million annually in

economic and technical assistance to Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Ethiopia, Somalia, Ghana, Liberia, and British African territories. Our 1959 fiscal year aid level will be greater than that of last year.

The United States Export-Import Bank has been providing African countries \$10 to \$15 million annually in development loans. The new Development Loan Fund is now beginning to announce approval of loans for African states. It is hoped that the volume of these loans can be increased, providing sufficient capital is made available by Congress.

In order to build sound and enduring economies in African territories, investment and expanding trade are necessary. Here private investment must play its part. In this connection it is of interest to note that the Stanford Research Institute has just recently announced a program to stimulate private overseas investment in Africa. This new program, made possible by funds from private industries and foundations, will compile information on investment opportunities throughout the continent.

In his address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 18,³ Secretary Dulles outlined eight steps that the United States would be prepared, subject to action by Congress as appropriate, to take or support in the coming year for worldwide economic-development purposes.

These steps, which bear repeating at this time because of their applicability to African needs, would include:

1. Pressing vigorously and effectively forward with existing development financing programs;
2. Increasing efforts to emphasize the constructive role that private initiative can play in economic development;
3. Considering how the United States might cooperate with regional development programs, where desired by the countries of the region and where the advantage of the regional over the bilateral approach would be evident;
4. Considering the advisability of increasing the capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the quotas of the International Monetary Fund;
5. Considering the feasibility of creating an International Development Association, as an

affiliate of the International Bank, under conditions likely to assure broad and effective support;

6. Supporting vigorously technical assistance through our own programs, through the expanded United Nations technical assistance programs, and through a substantial initial contribution to the new United Nations Special Projects Fund;

7. Enlisting the assistance of United States universities and scientific institutions, joining with those of other cooperating countries to achieve scientific and technological breakthroughs on problems of particular concern to less developed countries; and

8. Seeking funds from the Congress for health programs.

It is anticipated that in the months ahead the administration will set forth fuller details of these programs.

Conclusions

I have spoken at some length on Africa's political, economic, and social problems and developments and our relationship thereto. Let us summarize our conclusions.

First, the United States must properly evaluate the dynamic political forces currently at work in Africa. Recognizing the vital interdependence of Africa and Europe, we must also support constructive African political evolution and work for mutual understanding of our own policies and support for our common ideals as set forth in the United Nations Charter.

Africa is generally friendly to the West, although independent African states have evinced no apparent desire to formulate formal alliances. Threatening this basic attitude of friendliness, however, is the insidious international Communist force, which would deny the area to the West and ensnare it into the political and socioeconomic slavery of communism. We of the West have no time to lose. We must anticipate events, sympathetically understand African aspirations, and help to meet them.

Second, as it is clear that a basic African need is for timely help in economic and social development and the eradication of disease, ignorance, and poverty, the United States must act promptly, generously, and wisely with adequate economic and technical assistance to this vast underdeveloped continent. To do so we must have the full

³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 6, 1958, p. 525.

understanding and support of the American people.

The opportunity to develop a sound base for enduring friendly relations and mutual cooperation with an emerging Africa is ours today. We must make the most of this opportunity without delay.

Date Set for Technical Talks on Preventing Surprise Attack

Following is an exchange of notes between the Governments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. concerning a meeting of technical experts to study methods to lessen the danger of surprise military attack.

U.S. NOTE OF OCTOBER 10¹

Press release 600 dated October 10

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to note 53/OSA of September 15, 1958, regarding a meeting of technical experts to study the practical aspects of minimizing the possibility of surprise attack.

The Government of the United States believes that the primary purpose of the meeting should be to examine the methods and objects of control and to assess the results that might be obtained from the adoption of those methods in lessening the danger of surprise military attack. The study should be undertaken with a view to the preparation of a technical report which could be recommended for consideration by governments. The report would be useful in the subsequent examination among governments at an appropriate level of the problem of introducing measures against surprise attack. As stated in its note of July 31,² the United States considers that the discussions should take place without prejudice to the respective positions of the two Governments as to the delimitation of areas within which measures might be established, or as to the timing or

interdependence of various aspects of disarmament.

With this understanding, the Government of the United States agrees to commencement of this meeting at Geneva on November 10. The United States hopes that substantial progress could be made in a meeting of four to five weeks as suggested by the Soviet Government.

With regard to the question of participation in the proposed meeting, the United States believes it would be appropriate to include experts from countries other than the United States and the U.S.S.R. in order to provide the broadest possible base of technical experience under varying conditions. After consultation with other nations the United States proposes that, for the Western countries, there will be experts from the United States, the U.K., France, Canada, Italy and possibly other countries. The names of the experts who will participate will be communicated in due course.

The comments in the United States note of July 31, with regard to the question of flights of United States aircraft carrying nuclear weapons, with which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics takes issue in its note of September 15, were directed to the charges made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' representative in the Security Council of the United Nations in April of this year.³ At that time, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' representative spoke of the "practice of regular United States bomber flights armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs which proceed towards the borders of the Soviet Union upon the giving of an alarm." The United States reaffirms the statement contained in its note of July 31 "that the United States has never had the need to launch nor has it in fact ever launched any atomic bomber flights of this type."

SOVIET NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 15

Unofficial translation

Note No. 53/OSA

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR presents its compliments to the Embassy of the USA, and referring to note number 128 of July 31, 1958, has the honor to state the following:

The Soviet Government notes the favorable attitude of the Government of the USA towards the proposal set

¹ Delivered by the American Embassy to the Soviet Foreign Office at Moscow on Oct. 10.

² For text, see BULLETIN of Aug. 18, 1958, p. 278.

³ For background, see *ibid.*, May 12, 1958, p. 760.

forth in the message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, N. S. Khrushchev, to the President of the USA, D. Eisenhower, of July 2, 1958⁴ that in the near future appropriate representatives, including representatives of *military agencies* of both countries, designated by the Governments of the USSR, USA, and also, possibly by the governments of some other states should meet for the joint study of practical aspects of the problem of preventing surprise attack and should work out, during the course of a definite period of time limit put in advance, recommendations concerning measures for preventing the possibility of a surprise attack.

In advancing the proposal concerning the conducting of a meeting on the level of experts, the Soviet Government proceeded from the fact that such a meeting would be fruitful if its work is directed toward the working out of practical recommendations concerning measures to prevent surprise attack in combination with definite steps in the field of disarmament. As the Government of the USA is aware, in the message of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR of July 2 it is stated that the Soviet Union proposes the reaching of agreement on establishment of control posts at railroad junctions, at large ports and on principal automobile thoroughfares, in combination with specific steps in disarmament, and also concerning the carrying out of aerial photography in areas having an important significance from the point of view of the prevention of the danger of surprise attack.

Therefore the assertion of the Government of the US that allegedly the Soviet Government agrees that these discussions should not predetermine the corresponding positions of both governments in connection with the time and the interdependence of the different aspects of disarmament has no foundation. Moreover, it is clear that the experts will have to give serious attention also to such technical questions as means and objects of control and the results which might be secured by these measures.

As the Soviet Government has already stated an understanding on the measures of preventing surprise attack is completely possible given conditions of fair consideration of mutual interests and rejection of such actions as would lead to a sharpening of the international situation and the increasing of the danger of war. Of course, a decision on the creation of mutual principles of a system of preventing the possibility of surprise attack must be adopted by the governments and not by the experts who will only conduct preparatory work. However, the working out by the experts and practical recommendations on concrete ways to prevent surprise attack undoubtedly will necessitate fruitful examination of the question about prevention of surprise attack at a meeting of heads of governments.

In the note of the Embassy of the USA, the question is again raised about the flights of military planes of the USA in the region of the Arctic and about an Arctic zone of inspection. The Government of the US in this note gives categoric assurance that the US has never had the need to carry out flights of military planes with hydrogen

and atomic bombs in the direction of the frontiers of the Soviet Union. It is impossible, however, not to note that statements of the Government of the US that allegedly American atomic bombers are not carrying out flights in the direction of the frontiers of the USSR look unconvincing in the light of the statements of its representatives in the U.N. Security Council and also the statement of US Secretary of State Dulles at the press conference which took place on 1 May.⁵ As is known, in this statement Mr. Dulles directly announced that if the Soviet Union agrees to the establishment of international inspection in the Arctic, then the USA "would then feel it safe greatly to reduce to a minimum these flights against which the Soviet Union protests". Answering a question whether the US will cease such flights in case of establishment of inspection in the Arctic Mr. Dulles declared that this will depend on what information the US receives as a result of realization of inspection. These statements of Mr. Dulles clearly confirm the flights of American planes loaded with atomic and hydrogen bombs in the direction of the frontiers of the Soviet Union. As for the question about an Arctic zone of inspection which is broached in the note of the Embassy of the USA the position of the Soviet Union on this question was set forth earlier with exhaustive fullness.

In connection with the practical side of the convocation of a meeting of experts the Soviet Government has no objection to the time and place proposed by the US in the note of 31 July for convocation of a meeting of experts. But if the Government of the USA is not ready for this in the said time, on our part there is no objection also that the meeting be called later as is proposed in the note of the Embassy of the USA of 8 September.⁶ Proceeding from this, the Soviet Government proposes that a meeting of experts should begin in Geneva on 10 November having in mind that its work should be concluded in the shortest possible time, for example in the course of four to five weeks.

In the opinion of the Soviet Government it seems expedient that in the meeting of experts besides the USSR and the USA other countries should also take part. Moreover, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to proceed from the principle of equal representation of countries which are members of the Atlantic Pact and countries included in the organization of the Warsaw Treaty. Taking this into account the Soviet Government proposes that in a meeting of experts representatives should take part from the USA, Great Britain, France, Belgium, USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania.

It goes without saying, the U.N. organization will be informed about the course of the experts' negotiations through the U.N. Secretary-General.

The Soviet Government hopes that the Government of the USA will carefully examine the considerations set forth in the present note and give a positive reply to the proposals advanced in it.

Moscow

September 15, 1958

⁵ *Ibid.*, May 19, 1958, p. 804.

⁶ For text, see *ibid.*, Sept. 29, 1958, p. 504.

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Aug. 18, 1958, p. 279.

U.S. Views on Communist Cease-Fire in Taiwan Straits Area

Statement by Acting Secretary Herter, October 6

Press release 585 dated October 6

The Department has noted a broadcast by the Peiping Radio of a statement attributed to the Chinese Communist Minister of National Defense. This statement, though replete with familiar Communist propaganda distortions regarding U.S. policies, seems to move in the direction of a cease-fire. It is therefore being carefully studied by the U.S. Government in close consultation with its ally, the Government of the Republic of China, which of course is primarily concerned. Whatever the Chinese Communist motivations, the United States welcomes their declared intentions to suspend bombardment of the offshore islands for 1 week and hopes this foreshadows a permanent cessation of their armed attack. Should this prove to be the case, there would seem to be no further necessity for the convoy of supply shipments to the offshore island positions. This question is being given careful consideration. It should be pointed out that U.S. escorts for these convoys in the offshore-island area have been limited strictly to international waters. The Department is glad to note the official statement made today by the Ministry of National Defense at Taipei that the Government of the Republic of China would not break the cease-fire.

Statement by Secretary Dulles, October 7¹

The Chinese Communists, after having brutally and incessantly bombarded Quemoy for over 6 weeks, now say they will be humanitarian and peaceful for 1 week.

It is not easy to evaluate that statement, but at least for the moment there is a cessation of the bombing. This the United States has been vigorously seeking, and also the development assures worldwide condemnation of the Chinese Communists if they again resume the fighting.

Department Statement, October 8

Press release 593 dated October 8

At the request of the Government of the Republic of China, the United States has engaged in

the escort of Chinese vessels resupplying Quemoy. This escort activity was ordered to the extent militarily necessary. No modification of this order is needed.

The Chinese Communists' halt of attacks on the offshore islands and on resupply operations to these islands suspends the military necessity for United States escort operations. If the Chinese Communist attacks are resumed, then, under the order, United States escort activity will be resumed forthwith to the extent necessary.

There has been full consultation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of China as to this matter.

U.S. Announces Withdrawal of Forces From Lebanon

Department Statement

Press release 589 dated October 8

The Government of the United States announces that by agreement with the Government of the Republic of Lebanon it has now been decided to complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from Lebanon. It is expected that, barring unforeseen developments, the forces will all be withdrawn by the end of October.

The United States sent forces to Lebanon in response to the urgent appeal of the then government of that country for assistance in maintaining Lebanese independence and integrity.¹ At the same time the United States took steps in the United Nations with a view to having it take measures to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon and thus facilitate the withdrawal of the U.S. forces. Subsequently the U.N. General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution² developed by the Arab states and designed to insure respect by states for the freedom, independence, and integrity of other states and to establish practical arrangements to uphold the purposes and principles of the charter in relation to Lebanon.

The steps which have been taken with respect to the situation in Lebanon have led to a substantial improvement in the international aspects of

¹ Made at the Washington National Airport.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Aug. 4, 1958, p. 181.

² Ibid., Sept. 15, 1958, p. 409.

the Lebanese security situation. The current unrest appears to have essentially domestic origins. In view of the progress made toward more stable international conditions in the area, it has been concluded that U.S. forces can now be totally withdrawn from Lebanon. It is the confident hope of the U.S. Government that the Republic of Lebanon, its sovereignty and independence strengthened, will move forward in unity, peace, and prosperity.

Military Survey Team Sent to Jordan

Press release 605 dated October 11

A military survey team headed by Brig. Gen. Richard A. Ridsen, U.S. Army, has been dispatched to Jordan at the request of the Jordanian Government to make a study of the organization, administration, and equipment of the Arab Army of Jordan. The survey team is due to arrive in Jordan on October 14.

Developing Universal Respect for the Rule of Law

by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy¹

The thought of the probity and compassion, the morality and charity of St. Ives, your patron saint, led me, in traveling from Washington to Boston this morning, into an intriguing speculation as to the reactions which that saintly man might have experienced were he involved in today's international politics. What would he have said, for example, after listening to a few sample broadcasts in the daily output of Moscow and Peiping? What would he have thought of their distortions, their bland disregard for elemental honesty, their vicious purpose to destroy a form of society which recognizes the Deity and to replace it with an atheistic materialism?

I am sure that, had he been asked, St. Ives would have expressed confidence that, during the 700 years after his birth, the world would have been wise enough to have developed a universal respect for the rule of law. Perhaps he himself was too wise to have attempted to prophesy.

What could be more repugnant to the rule of law than military suppression by a foreign power of the national aspiration of an entire people to enjoy national independence? Yet in this 20th century the Soviet Union, whose radio daily describes it as a peace-loving government, sent its

armies across the Carpathian frontier in a brutal suppression of the aspirations of the Hungarian people to regain their independence, after many years of occupation by Soviet forces and an imposed satellite government. Despite this classical act of aggression which belies any pretense of respect for the rule of law, the Soviet official position continues to give lip service to the rule of law by leveling synthetic charges of aggressive acts and intent against our Government.

The Middle East Situation

For our part we believe that the charter of the United Nations and the processes of that organization are powerful instruments of world law. I know that you do not want to be burdened with a lengthy exposé of the Middle East situation. It provides, however, an excellent example of the respect which this country has for the rule of law. As you know, during the critical situation which developed in the Middle East this summer, President Eisenhower took the grave decision of sending American troops to that country, at the express request of the duly constituted authorities of Lebanon, to assist Lebanon to maintain its independence. This decision was taken in full conformity with the United Nations Charter, which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defense. It was a step taken in the certain conviction that, if the West were to ignore the appeal of this peaceful Middle East state, in grave dan-

¹ Remarks made before the Catholic Lawyers' Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston at Boston, Mass., on Oct. 1 (press release 576). Mr. Murphy became on this occasion the first recipient of the St. Ives Award, which the Guild will present annually to a person of international preeminence in some branch of the law.

ger of losing its independence, one small nation after another could be destroyed in a fashion which in the 1930's led inevitably to global conflict.

We were prompt to report our move to the Security Council of the United Nations, making clear that the military measures would be terminated "as soon as the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." The Security Council, hamstrung by Soviet veto (I believe its 85th veto in that organization), was unable to take further action. But we did not stop there, and in the special session of the General Assembly our President presented his six-point plan for peace,² which would provide a setting for political order responsive to the will of the people of each nation, which would avoid the dangers of a regional arms race and would permit the peoples of the area to devote their energies to the tasks of development and human progress. As you know, much of the President's program was reflected in the resolution sponsored by the Arab countries themselves and unanimously adopted by the General Assembly on August 21.³

Thus significant agreement was reached on three crucial points: (1) that states should respect the freedom, independence, and integrity of other states and avoid fomenting civil strife; (2) that the United Nations should buttress this pledge of noninterference in the Middle East; and (3) that United Nations measures to insure the territorial integrity and independence of these countries would facilitate the early withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan. Subsequently the distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, undertook a useful mission to the Middle East, and his initial report⁴ has yesterday been submitted to the United Nations General Assembly. In the light of all these developments it has been possible to begin the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Lebanon.⁵ Thus it is clear that American respect for the rule of law as represented in the legal processes of the United Nations and our cooperation with that organization, in the interests of world peace and the rights of small nations, has

provided a classic demonstration which, I believe, were he here today, would be pleasing to your patron saint. The contrast with the behavior of the Soviet Union has never been made clearer.

Situation in the Far East

I would ask your indulgence to add a brief comment regarding a situation in another world area which is not without current interest. I refer to the Far East.

Our Secretary of State in his able address in September 1957 to the United Nations General Assembly⁶ said:

If there is any one thing that history demonstrates, it is that it is impossible to preserve peace indefinitely unless that peace is based upon justice and upon law.

Now what can we say of the progress of the rule of law in the light of the Chinese Communist attack? Certainly it is clear that the brutal assault by the military forces of the Soviet Union upon the freedom-loving people of Hungary has now been followed by the equally outrageous resort to naked force of Communist China. After a period of relative and extended calm there began on August 23 a violent and intense artillery attack against the offshore islands of Formosa. A day and night bombardment by literally hundreds of heavy-caliber guns of Soviet origin has continued for over a month now, largely concentrated on Little and Big Quemoy Islands. Significantly this bombardment has been accompanied by a barrage of Peiping Radio announcements that it is Peiping's purpose to force the capitulation of the Government of the Republic of China and to drive out the military forces of the United States from the entire Taiwan area. The announcements have been couched in the hostile terms of threats and have been repeated in the same tone by the Soviet Union.

The offshore islands, the Quemoy and Matsu, have never been in the possession of the Communist regime on the mainland. It might be well for us to recall that a last phase of the ground fighting between Communists and Nationalists in China was a Communist effort to take Quemoy in October of 1949. Communist troops were landed but were driven off by Nationalist forces in a bitter battle. Just as in the case of the Ko-

² BULLETIN of Sept. 1, 1958, p. 337.

³ For text, see *ibid.*, Sept. 15, 1958, p. 411.

⁴ U.N. doc. A/3934/Rev. 1.

⁵ For text of a Department statement, see p. 650.

⁶ BULLETIN of Oct. 7, 1957, p. 555.

rean armistice lines, the situation in the Formosa Strait reflects essentially the actual military position when the main fighting stopped. It is this situation the Chinese Communists are now attempting to alter by force.

Obviously when a government has certain territories under its authority it does not easily abandon them. The fact that the islands are close to the mainland is hardly an excuse to seize them. When one regime attempts by force to take additional territory which has long been under the authority of another government, world order is endangered, especially when the two contesting parties are allied, each, respectively, with one of two major powers.

The Republic of China is determined to hold these territories, and that determination stems from many factors.

The United States has a collective-defense treaty with the Republic of China. Pursuant to that treaty our country has given substantial military assistance to the Republic. But it is agreed between us that the use of force by either of the signatories "will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense."⁷ There has been no aggressive or offensive use of force by the United States or by the Republic of China against Communist China.

We are convinced that it is in the interest neither of the United States, nor of its allies in Asia, nor of the free world to retreat in the face of a blatant display of force or of threats such as those recently expressed in the letter of Chairman Khrushchev to President Eisenhower. That letter was couched in terms so gross that it was unacceptable, and it had to be returned.⁸ We believe that to fall back under such circumstances would merely encourage the leadership of the Sino-Soviet bloc in the false belief that it is in a position to threaten anywhere and to force concessions under a threat of force. Thus a retreat would not mark the end. It would simply mean that the bloc would continue with greater arro-

gance and perhaps with more miscalculation its utter disregard for international law and order, thus increasing the danger of general war.

Therefore we find that it is in our own interests to assist the Republic of China in the defense of its present position. Moreover, we believe—and I think you as distinguished jurists particularly will understand this—that there should be active public opinion in the world at large which would recognize the danger and assist in making it possible to achieve a cease-fire in the area. It is our purpose to create an atmosphere in which features that could reasonably be regarded as provocative might be eliminated through peaceful negotiation. We are, of course, pledged to take no action which would prejudice the rights of our valiant ally, the Government of the Republic of China.

The American Ambassador in Warsaw [Jacob D. Beam] is, as you know, engaged in negotiations with the Chinese Communist representative, Ambassador Wang Ping-nan. This is a practical attempt, using customary diplomatic means, to arrive at a peaceful settlement. Our objective, first, is to obtain a cease-fire in the area. There have been five meetings thus far, but we do not despair of the possibility that, even if no formalized agreement is achieved, there may be developed a situation of *de facto* tranquillity comparable to that which has existed for most of the time during the past 9 years. Should these discussions fail, there could be further recourse if necessary to the forum of the United Nations. In any event, it is the purpose of the United States to pursue every opportunity of achieving a peaceful solution of a situation which is both grave and dangerous.

Letters of Credence

Finland

The newly appointed Ambassador of Finland, Richard Rafael Seppala, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on October 8. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 588.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Jan. 24, 1955, p. 152.

⁸ For background, see *ibid.*, Oct. 6, 1958, p. 530.

Components of Inter-American Understanding

by Roy R. Rubottom, Jr.

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs¹

The governments and peoples of Latin America and the United States have traditionally been the best of friends. This friendship is not only derived from our geographical relationship, the broad identity of our aims and interests, and our similar traditions but from understanding of each other's history, culture, political philosophies, aspirations, and problems. You may be certain that our policies are based on further strengthening these ties.

Recently much public attention has been focused on United States policy toward Latin America. I trust that just as much soul searching has gone into the examination of the policies of Latin America toward the United States.

Today's challenge in this friendly setting of America is principally that of understanding one another. In Latin America there are serious misunderstandings and misconceptions with respect to the United States and its attitudes toward Latin America. In the United States there is an equally serious lack of understanding with respect to Latin America. Both of these problems can best be treated with the helping remedy of truth.

Let me review briefly what the United States has done to ascertain the facts about Latin America's situation during the past year and a half. Early in 1957 we realized all too well the extent of the adverse economic factors which were creating problems for our friends to the south. There began a series of factfinding visits to the area by high officials of this Government who wanted to learn about the problems at first hand. In August of 1957 the Buenos Aires Economic

Conference gave Secretary of the Treasury Anderson an opportunity to visit Argentina, with a brief stopover in Brazil. Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank, were also on the delegation to the conference and visited other countries en route.²

In May of this year Vice President Nixon made his eventful visit to eight South American countries, including Argentina, where he represented President Eisenhower at the inauguration of President Frondizi.³ This was followed by a trip in July to Central America and Panama by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, as personal representative of the President.⁴ He was accompanied by Mr. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Tom Coughran, and Mr. Dempster McIntosh, Director of the Development Loan Fund.

Most recently Secretary Dulles visited Brazil, where bilateral and hemisphere matters of interest to the two countries were discussed with President Kubitschek and other high Brazilian officials.⁵ I accompanied the Secretary and was also on the other trips mentioned above.

While such visits as these do not in themselves provide the solutions to the problems between the United States and Latin America, they certainly

² For statements by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dillon and text of the Economic Declaration of Buenos Aires, see *BULLETIN* of Sept. 30, 1957, p. 539.

³ For remarks made by President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon on Mr. Nixon's return to Washington, see *ibid.*, June 9, 1958, p. 950.

⁴ For a statement made by Dr. Eisenhower on his return, see *ibid.*, Aug. 25, 1958, p. 309.

⁵ For texts of two joint communiques issued on Aug. 6 at the close of Secretary Dulles' visit, together with remarks and an address by Secretary Dulles, see *ibid.*, p. 301.

¹ Address made before the Pacific Coast Council on Latin American Studies at Santa Barbara, Calif., on Oct. 10 (press release 595 dated Oct. 9).

indicate our deep interest in the area and are mentioned here to provide the necessary background against which to appraise the recent steps taken by the Governments of the United States and the other American Republics to meet with positive action the complex problems confronting them.

The meeting in Washington 2 weeks ago between the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics was but the most recent of a series of significant developments.⁶ That meeting crystallized in dramatic fashion the desire for cooperation and mutual understanding and the determination jointly to tackle the serious problems which are of concern to us all. It set into motion specific consultative processes aimed at concrete problems of economic development and trade. As the Foreign Ministers themselves announced at the end of their meeting, "a harmonious and carefully planned joint effort . . . will contribute enormously to strengthening the solidarity of the hemisphere and to the well-being of all Americans."

A few weeks before the Foreign Ministers meeting—on August 12—Under Secretary Dillon announced that the United States was prepared to consider the establishment of an inter-American regional development institution.⁷ Studies looking forward to this additional resource for economic improvement in the hemisphere are now in process. Their completion was given a new note of urgency by the American Foreign Ministers.

Since last June the United States has been participating in an international coffee study group established to examine coffee trade problems and recommend measures to be taken to meet them. The extension by the United States Congress this year of the reciprocal trade agreement authorization and the increase of \$2 billion in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank are additional measures which will benefit Latin America economically. Congress also took notice of another important front and voted an increase of \$2 million in the Latin American educational and cultural exchange program.

The foregoing are illustrative of the positive steps which are being taken to fulfill our pledge that, as Latin America's problems increase, our

desire to cooperate in finding solutions increases correspondingly. They presage new efforts toward understanding and toward progress on the part of all concerned and testify to the effectiveness of good will, fact finding, and international cooperation in coping with the demands of an ever-changing world. Now let us examine certain of Latin America's aspirations and the extent to which we have been able to identify ourselves with them.

Economic Development

Nowhere in the world is there a greater demand for economic development than from the people of Latin America. Their population is increasing explosively, approximately 2.7 percent per year, the fastest in the world. Housing and educational facilities are inadequate. The countries want to industrialize just as fast as possible. Everywhere I traveled over the past 5 months—and I covered more than 50 thousand miles in visiting nearly every country in Latin America—I heard similar expressions: "We must have loans for housing—for irrigation facilities—for new factories—for modern equipment—for highways and railroads, indeed for airplanes too—for schools." The list is long.

The United States is trying to help Latin America to meet some of these goals. Loans to Latin American countries by the United States Export-Import Bank totaled \$2.2 billion during the 10-year period from 1948 to 1958. This represented more than 40 percent of the total of all loans made by the bank during that time. The United States stands ready to make additional loans for sound projects. Yet it becomes obvious that, no matter what our desires to be helpful, we can only meet a small part of the tremendous capital needs for development out of public funds. It is for that reason that we are convinced that the main reliance for the rapid economic development of Latin America must necessarily be placed on private enterprise—not just from the United States and other foreign sources but also from domestic private sources. Fortunately, in our opinion, these private resources are not only available to fill a need which public resources simply are unable to fill, but they also have proven themselves to be efficient and effective down through the years.

In the past 12 years the book value of direct private United States investment in Latin

⁶ For a Department announcement of the meeting and text of communique approved on Sept. 24, see *ibid.*, Oct. 13, 1958, p. 574.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Sept. 1, 1958, p. 347.

America has grown from \$3 billion to almost \$9 billion, this accounting for more than one-third of our total private investment abroad. The rate of flow has been about \$600 million annually, although the 1957 total reached \$1.3 billion. This flow can be speeded up, provided conditions are established which attract private capital.

Obviously, capital is most attracted to those places where budgets are balanced, currencies are properly valued, credit is held to manageable proportions, and production is encouraged—in short, where inflation has been held in check.

But the contribution of private capital cannot be measured in money resources alone. Along with it come the results of research, technology, know-how, new skills, and new products, as well as expanded opportunity for the individual and a higher standard of living for all.

As Secretary Dulles stated in his address to the United Nations General Assembly on September 18:*

The United States will undertake increased efforts to emphasize the constructive role that private initiative can play in economic development. We hope that other nations will also explore these important potentialities.

In this connection I would like to emphasize that the United States recognizes each country's right to develop its resources as it sees fit. By the same token, and recognizing the limitations on public funds available for lending, we do not wish to be misunderstood when we state that, based on our own experience, these limited public funds can only supplement and strengthen the efforts of private enterprise and are not available as a substitute for, or to compete with, private enterprise.

The record does show, however, that the United States has loaned funds to state-owned enterprises where private capital was not available. Without taking the time to mention all such instances, we have authorized credits in Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, and Mexico for the purpose of helping to develop public-owned steel plants, hydroelectric power installations, transportation systems, port improvements, and other projects.

Basic Commodities

There is need for sober discussion on the important subject of basic commodities. Certainly

one of the major objectives of Latin Americans is to receive stable and remunerative prices for their primary commodities. We share this aspiration, and indeed it is in our interest to have them achieve it. It is generally agreed that prices of primary commodities are subject to wider fluctuations than are those of manufactured goods and that in times of recession these prices tend to drop sooner and farther than prices of manufactured products. To those countries whose economies rest on one or a very few export products this fact illustrates all too clearly their vulnerability.

I wish to emphasize that it would be a basic error to assume that the United States is indifferent to or complacent about this general problem. Quite the contrary. We recognize the serious difficulties confronting many of the Latin American countries by reason of wide fluctuation in prices of basic commodities. We recognize that it is a problem vital to Latin America. We recognize, moreover, that it is a *mutual* problem, that violent fluctuations in prices help nobody but speculators, and that depressed prices of raw materials result immediately in lowered capacity of Latin America to import from the United States. We are, in short, deeply concerned with this whole matter.

The United States has no ready or simple answer to the complex problem of terms of trade and primary commodity prices. Solutions proposed in the past have usually tended to center almost entirely upon the commodity agreement as the instrument to stabilize commodity prices and the relationship with manufactured products. Recently there has been a growing understanding of the technical complexity of commodity problems and an interest in a more careful analysis of these problems aimed at finding areas of agreement and of feasible cooperative effort. The United States is prepared to sit down and discuss these problems. We are prepared to examine pragmatically and on a case-by-case basis the question of what measures might offer a solution to commodity problems. This, as you know, is what we are doing in the case of coffee. We likewise participate in the Committee of Basic Products established in the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in compliance with a recommendation of the Buenos Aires conference. The communiqué of the American Foreign Ministers re-

* *Ibid.*, Oct. 6, 1958, p. 525.

leased at the close of the informal meeting in Washington last month expressed the concern of the Ministers over this very problem. It urged consultations between interested members of the Organization of American States, on a bilateral and multilateral basis as well as with producer and consumer countries of other geographic areas.

Whatever solutions may appear to be indicated, I think it must be realized that there will be definite limits to what the United States itself can do. Aid in these problems, whether it be monetary-stabilization loans or economic cooperation in some other form, cannot do more than provide time for sound policies by the affected countries themselves to become effective. Aid will be useless if it supports policies which run counter to the fundamental forces of the market.

Regional Markets

The United States has followed with keen interest Latin American proposals for attaining closer economic integration as a means to promote economic development. It is fully aware of the studies made and those in process in the Economic Commission for Latin America. Only a few months ago the Central American countries signed a multilateral trade treaty and an agreement on industrial integration, both of which are now pending ratification.

This country has looked with favor upon the European undertaking toward economic integration through a customs union or a free-trade area designed to eliminate duties and other trade restrictions on substantially all intraregional trade and, at the same time, to maintain duties on trade with countries outside the area at approximately current levels. It is also recognized that, in specific cases, exceptions in the application of these criteria may be necessary. Each such exception must be judged on its individual merit, and agreement therewith must depend largely on assessment of the extent to which it would contribute to the establishment of a true common market, to the promotion of competition, and to the bringing about of increased trade with nonmember countries as well as within the area.

Economic circumstances in Latin America are, of course, quite different from those in Western Europe, but the United States believes that the possible advantages of closer Latin American economic integration justify the careful consideration

now being given to this problem. It further believes that the integration sought would best be advanced by regional agreements based on the criteria above outlined, and it continues to stand ready to assist, as appropriate, in financing economically sound industries established under agreements conforming to these criteria. Availability of such financing would likewise, the U.S. believes, encourage private capital investment in those industries.

Dedication to Democracy

In thinking about how best to convey the spirit of devotion with which the United States holds to democratic principles, I decided to use the words of President Eisenhower addressed to the new Ambassador of Venezuela [Marcos Falcón Briceño] last August:

The United States believes firmly in the democratic elective process and the choice by the people, through free and fair elections, of democratic governments responsive to them. Authoritarianism and autocracy, of whatever form, are incompatible with the ideals of our great leaders of the past. Free institutions, respect for individual rights, and the inherent dignity of man are the heritage of our Western civilization.

The price of this devotion has been the lives of hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens, given not that we alone could be free but that others too could have the kind of life they want.

There are some important corollaries to this statement by the President. One is that states, irrespective of size or place, are juridically equal. Another is that states do not intervene in the affairs of others, perhaps the most widely cherished of all American credos. Still another, approved in 1948 at the Bogotá conference, stated that continuity of diplomatic relations among the American states was desirable and declared that the maintenance of such relations does not involve any judgment of the internal policies of another government. These principles, I would like to reiterate, were not merely pious hopes. They were formally voted on and agreed to by all the American Republics, the United States included, and form a large part of the foundation on which inter-American solidarity and cooperation rest.

Now the mere restatement of such principles as these does not automatically result in democracy. In the first place democracy can only be achieved from within a country when a people want it—

certainly nobody can impose it against a people's will. Then I think we should recognize that democracy may assume different forms in different countries. No two methods of government, any more than two individuals, can be exactly alike. Thus we should not be surprised when the emerging patterns of government, indeed democratic government, differ from country to country.

Finally, on this subject, democracy is not achieved all at once. It is a continuing process of growth and development. Its attainment is the result of the unselfish efforts of countless individuals who together mold a country along the lines they want. We can be encouraged by the progress made in the past few years. Democratic institutions throughout the Americas have been notably strengthened.

Mutuality of Understanding

The theme of mutuality has been woven throughout my remarks tonight. Certainly the problems we face in the Americas are mutual, but there is also a need for us to understand each other better. We err just as much when we misunderstand as we do when we lack the knowledge on which understanding is based.

No matter how much the United States wants to assist Latin America, there are limits on its field of action and its power of decision. Many factors are joined in the determination of what the United States can and cannot do in any given instance. Our friends must not forget that we are a democracy. Such factors as public opinion, congressional attitudes, and legislation itself must be weighed in the scales. We are quite human and finite and have the same kind of internal problems as do other countries themselves.

When considering problems related to economic development, especially the provision of needed capital, no outside assistance, whether from public or private sources, will be truly effective in achieving strong, self-reliant economies in the absence of rational, sound economic policies to go with it. In fact, primary responsibility for remedial action to solve economic problems rests with the affected countries themselves, and the most the United States can do is to assist in providing some of the missing ingredients.

It should not be overlooked that the U.S. is also a "developing" country. Our citizens work and

live in a dynamic, not a static, society. Our needs are never fully met. To provide for this nation in motion is a costly undertaking, especially when more than half our budget is for national and free-world defense; yet our people have not flinched when called upon for individual and national cooperation. I think President Eisenhower voiced a national realization when he told the American Foreign Ministers only 16 days ago that peace, prosperity, and security are in the long run indivisible.

Fortunately the awareness that these problems are indeed mutual and that each country must work energetically and harmoniously to resolve them is more widespread than ever before. This sense of joint effort is in fact now a dynamic principle in the American family. Let me refer once again to the remarkable meeting of the Foreign Ministers which took place last month as a graphic and dramatic example of this. The American Republics have fortunately developed over the years a unity of purpose, spirit, and accomplishment truly unique in the world. Our present sense of solidarity, of the necessity for truly constructive cooperation, and the awareness of the world context in which events are transpiring make it possible to foresee very effective joint action rooted in mutual respect and clear understanding of each other's problems, difficulties, and limitations. We acknowledge human frailty and the finiteness of all human endeavor, but we have faith in the common ideals that unite us. If we can continue to work together with courage, imagination, mutual respect, and understanding, then I suggest that it would not be too naive to expect the American family to demonstrate to the world an effective means of meeting the age-old challenges of poverty, disease, security, and peace with justice, without at the same time sacrificing our cherished ideals of freedom and the dignity of the individual.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1958

A PROCLAMATION¹

WHEREAS during the war for American independence brave men from across the seas left their homelands to fight by our side for the cause of liberty; and

WHEREAS one of the most valiant of these warriors was Casimir Pulaski, a Polish count who, after distinguishing

¹ No. 3260; 23 *Fed. Reg.* 7833.

himself in several encounters, died at the age of thirty-one from a wound received while leading a cavalry attack to relieve the city of Savannah; and

WHEREAS October 11, 1958, is the one hundred and seventy-ninth anniversary of the death of this youthful foe of tyranny, whose ideals and selfless purpose set a glorious example to all men who are willing to give their strength for freedom; and

WHEREAS it is fitting that we should mark this anniversary with ceremonies designed to honor this gallant Pole, who attained the rank of Brigadier General in our Continental Army:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Saturday, October 11, 1958, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all Government buildings on that day. I also invite our people to observe the day with suitable manifestations of respect for the memory of General Casimir Pulaski and for the cause which commanded his allegiance.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this seventh day of October in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred [SEAL] and fifty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-third.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

U.S. Sells Antipolio Vaccine to Poland

Press release 601 dated October 10

A cargo of Salk antipolio vaccine, purchased by the Polish Government, is scheduled to leave Indianapolis on October 12 by a U.S. commercial airplane bound for Warsaw. This shipment will provide the first round of antipolio inoculations for 3 million Polish children of preschool age in selected areas of Poland where poliomyelitis has been prevalent in recent years. A further shipment to provide a second round of shots for these children will be made from the United States later in the year.

An earlier program to inoculate children with Salk vaccine began in the flooded areas in Poland last July when the American Junior Red Cross airshipped to the Polish Red Cross nearly 11,000 doses of antipolio vaccine. This was followed by

a program to inoculate the most vulnerable groups in the Polish population, undertaken by the Polish Medical Aid Project in cooperation with CARE, through contributions of vaccine from pharmaceutical companies in the United States. Enough Salk vaccine was contributed to provide for 900,000 inoculations. The Polish Medical Aid Project enabled the Polish health authorities to institute at an early date an expanded program to combat the incidence of infantile paralysis in Poland.

The U.S. and Polish Governments have agreed to allocate \$1,200,000 for the purchase of Salk vaccine from funds available under the credits for Poland administered by the Export-Import Bank. The shipment which left Indianapolis on October 12 was purchased from these funds. Agencies of the U.S. and Polish Governments have cooperated in arranging to expedite the shipment of Salk vaccine so that the first round of inoculations can be completed by the end of October 1958.

This vaccine was licensed for shipment by the Department of Commerce under the Export Control Act.

U.S. Seeks Further Information From U.S.S.R. on Crashed Plane

Press release 587 dated October 7

Department Announcement

On October 3, 1958, the American Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Llewellyn E. Thompson, delivered to Acting Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Vasili Kuznetsov a note requesting further information on the USAF C-130 transport plane which crashed on September 2, 1958, in Soviet Armenia.¹ Mr. Kuznetsov said that he would convey the contents of the note to the appropriate Soviet authorities.

Text of U.S. Note

OCTOBER 3, 1958

The Embassy of the United States of America refers to the following notes which have been exchanged in connection with the crash of a United

¹ For background and texts of U.S. notes, see BULLETIN of Sept. 29, 1958, p. 505; Oct. 6, 1958, p. 531; and Oct. 20, 1958, p. 618.

States C-130 transport aircraft on September 2, 1958: the Ministry's notes Nos. 52/OSA, September 12, 1958, and 57/OSA, September 19, 1958; and the Embassy's notes Nos. 252, September 6, 1958, 270, September 13, 1958, and 291, September 21, 1958.

On September 24, a representative of the United States Government received at the Soviet-Turkish frontier near Leninakan the remains of six airmen, transferred in accordance with the undertaking of the Soviet Government in the Ministry's note of September 19, 1958.

Although the Soviet Government has not given identification of the crashed and burned aircraft found 55 kilometers northwest of Yerevan, the United States Government considers that the wreckage mentioned in the Ministry's note of September 12 is that of the missing C-130 transport plane. Investigations undertaken by the Headquarters of the United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) and by the appropriate Turkish authorities establish that the C-130 aircraft was intercepted at about 2 P. M. on September 2 by Soviet fighter aircraft in the area of the Turkish-Soviet frontier west of the Aragats Mountain (Gora Aragats). The investigations also disclose that this C-130 aircraft was last seen flying on an easterly course in the direction of the mountain and that the Soviet aircraft were then in close proximity to it. A few minutes after the aircraft disappeared, an explosion occurred and a large column of smoke was seen rising from behind hills in Soviet territory in the direction of Aragats Mountain. In view of the proximity of the Soviet fighter planes to the C-130 aircraft, it must be assumed that the pilots of the Soviet aircraft involved in this interception had knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the crash of this unarmed American aircraft.

The Government of the United States, therefore, is still unable to understand the assertions by the Soviet Government that it has no knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the crash of the American aircraft. Nor does the United States Government understand why the Soviet Government appears unable to furnish any information regarding the whereabouts and condition of 11 members of the crew of this aircraft who are unaccounted for and still missing. The United States Government is prepared to extend whatever assistance the Soviet Government might

consider helpful in the search for these missing airmen.

As stated in the Embassy's note of September 13, the United States Government categorically rejects the Ministry's charge that this American aircraft intentionally violated Soviet airspace. This aircraft, based in Germany, was engaged in a routine flight over eastern Turkey and had filed in advance a standard instrument flight plan in accordance with international regulations. The commanding officer of the aircraft was under strict, standing orders not to violate Soviet airspace and the Government of the United States is convinced that he did not knowingly commit such a violation.

Under these circumstances, the Government of the United States repeats its request that complete information be furnished regarding the whereabouts and condition of the eleven members of the crew of the aircraft who are still missing; that a comprehensive report describing all pertinent facts surrounding the crash of this American aircraft be furnished the Embassy by the Soviet Government; and that United States Air Force technical experts be permitted to examine the plane wreckage at the crash site. The United States Government reserves the right to full compensation for the loss of life incurred and for the loss of this aircraft and its equipment.

U.S. Replies to Czechoslovak Protest on Border Violations

Following is a Department announcement and the text of a U.S. note to the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs (press release 578 dated October 2), together with the text of the Czechoslovak note to the U.S. Embassy at Prague.

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

In a note delivered on September 25, 1958, to the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the American Embassy at Prague, the U.S. Government documents the innocent nature of recent violations of the Czechoslovak frontier by American citizens and expresses the hope that the Czechoslovak Government would "take steps to permit the immediate departure from Czecho-

slovakia" of Pfc. Andrew A. Bellrichard of Ne-koosa, Wis., Pvt. Cole Youngert of Detroit, Mich., and Specialist Fourth Class John Kennedy of Philadelphia, Pa. The U.S. note, which replies to a Czechoslovak note of September 16, 1958, also refers to the 2-week detention of M. Sgt. James E. Cole of Connellsville, Pa., who has indicated that he was forced into Czechoslovakia at gun-point by Czechoslovak border guards, and to the detention of John B. Hardcastle of Nashville, Tenn., an American student. The U.S. note concludes that the American Embassy expects that, in all cases in which U.S. citizens are apprehended within the borders of Czechoslovakia, U.S. representatives will be granted immediate access to the individuals detained, in accordance with international comity and practice, and permitted to be present at any trial which may be held.

U.S. NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 25

The Embassy of the United States presents its compliments to the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has the honor to refer to the Ministry's protest of September 16, 1958 which refers to the unauthorized crossings of the Czechoslovak border by citizens of the United States. The Embassy acting under instructions would like to review briefly the facts of the incidents which are the subject of these protests.

Master Sergeant James E. Cole

Sergeant Cole disappeared on the morning of June 10, 1958 while fishing with a relative on the Dyje River near Hardegg on the Austro-Czechoslovak border. At the time of his disappearance, he was on authorized military leave from his unit in Germany and was visiting his wife's family in Austria. The Czechoslovak Border Guards assert that Sergeant Cole stepped onto an island in the river and, by so doing, violated Czechoslovak territory. Sergeant Cole has stated under oath that he did not leave the Austrian side of the river until forced to do so at gun point by Czechoslovak Border Guards. Sergeant Cole's statements have been carefully investigated and have been corroborated by all available evidence. Even if the Czechoslovak Border Guard version were correct, it is difficult for the United States to understand how a transgression under such circumstances could be branded as a "criminal

offense" and justify the three months' sentence imposed by the People's Court of Justice at Brno. Sergeant Cole was incarcerated from June 10 to June 24. Although he repeatedly requested access to American officials, he was held incommunicado throughout his entire period of detention. The Government of the United States was however gratified that Sergeant Cole was not required to complete the term of the sentence but was enabled to depart from Czechoslovakia on June 24, 1958.

John B. Hardcastle

American student John B. Hardcastle and two youthful companions visited the Austro-Czechoslovak border early in the afternoon of August 9, 1958. Mr. Hardcastle expressed the desire to be photographed while standing on the barrier across the road leading into Czechoslovakia. While doing so, he was arrested by two Czechoslovak Border Guards armed with machine guns. Three days of interrogation apparently convinced the Czechoslovak authorities that Mr. Hardcastle was not motivated by any evil intent and he was allowed to return to Austrian territory on August 12, 1958. Once again, United States authorities were not permitted access to an American citizen jailed in Czechoslovakia, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as late as August 12 maintained that it had no knowledge of the incident.

Andrew A. Bellrichard

Private First Class Bellrichard disappeared from his post on the German side of the German-Czechoslovak border about noon on July 7, 1958 after having been found asleep on duty some hours previously by a fellow soldier. Fearing that he would be punished for his negligence, Private Bellrichard, while apparently emotionally disturbed as a result of this incident, crossed into Czechoslovak territory, attracting attention to himself by firing three random bursts from the automatic weapon he was carrying. On August 15, 1958 he was sentenced by the District Court at Pilsen to two years' imprisonment for illegal border crossing. This severe sentence was upheld by the Czechoslovak Supreme Court, and Private Bellrichard has begun serving his term. Prolonged interrogation of this soldier by the Czechoslovak authorities must have established the facts as they are stated above. Accordingly while the Czechoslovak border may have been violated in a

technical sense, once again it appears perfectly clear that this was not covert entry for inimical purposes which could justify the punishment imposed.

Private Cole Youngert and Specialist John P. Kennedy

Although these two American soldiers have been in Czechoslovak custody since August 24, 1958 access to them has not been permitted, and therefore it has not been possible to determine the circumstances of their entry into Czechoslovakia. It has been ascertained however that these soldiers became intoxicated on the evening of August 23 in Weiden, Germany and that they took a taxicab from Weiden to the German Custom House at Waidhaus near the Czechoslovak border. The taxi driver has reported seeing these men disappear in the direction of Czechoslovakia, but no additional information is available to United States authorities.

In spite of the best intentions and careful controls, border violations are bound to occur. Although the Government of the United States has made every effort to prevent violations of Czechoslovak territory by American citizens and will continue to do so, it is only realistic to recognize that incidents such as those outlined above will happen and should not be regarded as an affront to the sovereignty of the country whose border may have been violated in a technical sense. The United States believes the Czechoslovak authorities should bear in mind that the innocent nature of the action in each individual case is proved by the openness of each incident and the absence of any evidence whatsoever that the individuals concerned acted with any intent to damage Czechoslovak interests.

Incidents of this type may be handled in a friendly and cooperative manner as is the usual international practice or they may be magnified into a major issue. The extreme sensitivity displayed by the Czechoslovak authorities in relation to these cases is regrettable. It is hoped that after reconsideration the Government of Czechoslovakia will take steps to permit the immediate departure from Czechoslovakia of the three soldiers still in custody. It is also hoped that the Czechoslovak authorities will demonstrate a more cooperative attitude in future so that technical border violations of an obviously innocent character will not be made to interfere with the de-

velopment of better relations between Czechoslovakia and the United States. The Embassy expects that in all cases when United States citizens are apprehended within the borders of Czechoslovakia, United States representatives will, in accordance with accepted international comity and practice, be promptly notified, granted immediate access to the individuals detained, and permitted to be present at any trial which may be held.

The Embassy of the United States of America avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the assurances of its high consideration.

CZECHOSLOVAK NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 16

Unofficial translation

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America and with reference to the Embassy's notes No. 37 of August 29, 1958¹ and No. 42 of September 4, 1958,¹ has the honor to advise that the number of unauthorized crossings of the Czechoslovak border by United States citizens is increasing constantly in spite of the repeated assurances by the Embassy of the United States of America that all necessary measures would be taken to prevent this from happening.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs lodges the strongest protest against these lately ever more numerous crossings, among which belongs also the case of Andrew A. Bellrichard, and expects that the American authorities will immediately take measures to prevent the repetition of similar incidents in the future.

As the Embassy was already advised by the note of August 19, 1958, Private First Class Andrew A. Bellrichard crossed the Czechoslovak border without permission, with a firearm in his hands. For this unauthorized crossing of the border, he was sentenced by the District Court at Plzen to 2 years of deprivation of liberty and an accessory punishment of expulsion from the territory of Czechoslovakia. In view of an appeal lodged by Andrew A. Bellrichard, his case was brought before the Supreme Court in Praha, which upheld and confirmed the sentence passed by the District Court, so far as the punishment of deprivation of liberty and the accessory penalty of expulsion are concerned.

As to the protest of the Embassy of the United States of America that a representative of the Embassy was barred from the appeals trial as an observer, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs advises that the Czechoslovak authorities permitted the Embassy of the United States of America to pay a consular visit to Andrew A. Bellrichard, prior to the date on which the sentence acquires legal power. The public was not permitted to be present at the appeals trial on the basis of Section 215 Paragraph

¹ Not printed here.

1 of the Czechoslovak Penal Code for reasons of endangering State secrets/Reconstruction of the offense, proved by photographs/; thus it was impossible for a representative of the Embassy to attend the appeals trial. The Ministry would like further to advise that, according to a communication of the competent Czechoslovak authorities, the sentenced Bellrichard has already started to serve his sentence of deprivation of liberty.

Another proof of the fact that no improvement has been effected by the American authorities in the case of frontier incidents, is a fresh case of an unauthorized crossing of the Czechoslovak border by Private Cole Youngert and Specialist John Kennedy, mentioned in the Embassy's note No. 42 of September 4, 1958, who, according to a communication from the competent Czechoslovak authorities, are within the territory of Czechoslovakia. As soon as the Ministry is in possession of further information relating to the investigation carried out in this respect, it will not fail to inform the Embassy thereof.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the United States of America the assurances of its high consideration.

PRAHA, September 16, 1958.

World Bank Makes Loan in Brazil for Hydroelectric Project

The World Bank announced on October 3 that it had made a loan equivalent to \$73 million in Brazil for the first stage of the largest hydroelectric project ever undertaken in Latin America. The completed project will bring an increase equal to 50 percent of the power capacity now available in central-southern Brazil, the area in which four-fifths of Brazil's industry and much of the agricultural activity is concentrated. The loan is, with the exception of that made 2 years ago for the Kariba Dam in Rhodesia, the largest the bank has ever made for a single project.

This project is the first in which private companies have joined official Brazilian agencies to carry out a large power development. Hitherto, additions to generating capacity in Brazil have been undertaken by private power companies to meet their own requirements or by public bodies set up to exploit particular reaches of the main rivers. In this case the borrower is Central Eletrica de Furnas, S.A., a joint enterprise formed 1½ years ago to construct, own, and operate the new plant. The common stock of the company, representing 50 percent of the equity capital, is held by the Brazilian Government, by the State of São Paulo, and by CEMIG (a corporation owned by the State of Minas Gerais); all three

of these stockholders have already received bank loans for power enterprises. The greater part of the preferred stock is held by private companies—51 percent by São Paulo Light Co., an affiliate of the Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Co. of Canada (already a bank borrower), and 9 percent by Companhia Paulista de Força e Luz, an affiliate of the American and Foreign Power Co.

The power station, to be built at Furnas Rapids on the Rio Grande 200 miles north of São Paulo, will ultimately have a capacity of 1,100,000 kilowatts, of which about 460,000 kilowatts will be installed as the first stage. The earth- and rock-fill dam will be nearly 400 feet high and will create a reservoir 150 miles long, having sufficient storage capacity to provide year-to-year regulation of the flow to the power station. Three other hydroelectric stations, one of them bank-financed, are already in operation or under construction on the Rio Grande. But the potential of this river is so immense that, even after the completion of Furnas, only about one-fifth of the total will have been realized.

All the power generated at Furnas will be sold in bulk to private and public suppliers in the States of Minas Gerais and São Paulo. The demand for power in the various parts of the area to be served by the new power station is growing at between 9 and 14 percent annually. By 1970 it is expected to have increased more than three-fold.

The main industrial concentration in the area to be served is around the city of São Paulo. Industry is also rapidly expanding northward. The manufacture of motorcars, trucks, and tractors, chemical and metallurgical production, oil refining, and many other industries are already established, and as new products are introduced the need for power will continue to rise. Belo Horizonte, capital of the State of Minas Gerais, is the center of Brazil's iron, manganese, bauxite, and other mineral production and has a large steel mill. Nearly 60 percent of power sales in the area is already accounted for by industrial and commercial users.

Construction of access roads and service buildings at Furnas is well under way. The civil-works contract has been allotted, after international bidding, to a British firm in association with a Brazilian contractor. A U.S. firm has been ap-

pointed as consultant. Contracts for electrical equipment are to be placed within the next 6 months, and the project is expected to be completed by the middle of 1963. Since the capacity included in the first stage is likely to be needed at once, it is planned that work on the second stage will follow quickly and be completed by 1965.

The cost of the first stage is estimated at the equivalent of approximately \$210 million. The bank's loan will cover the foreign-exchange expenditure included in this total. The balance will be met by share capital supplemented by loans from the National Development Bank of Brazil and the Federal Electrification Fund.

The loan is for a term of 25 years, with repayment starting on April 1, 1964. The rate of interest, including the 1 percent commission charged on bank loans and added to its special reserve, is 5¾ percent. The loan is guaranteed by the Government of Brazil.

Exemption of Functions Under Mutual Security Act

White House press release dated October 1

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President on October 1 issued an Executive order specifying laws from which functions authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be exempt.

Under section 533 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the President is authorized to waive various restrictive provisions of law as they relate to the mutual security program. The waivers are made in furtherance of purposes declared in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. The laws which may be waived are those regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds.

The order of October 1, which continues in force a number of prior waivers, extends them in two respects:

(1) With respect to contracts entered into with foreign governments or agencies thereof for the rendering of services to the United States or to an agency thereof within the continental limits of the United States, this order waives the statute requiring that Government contracts include pro-

visions for the examination of the records of contractors by the General Accounting Office (section 1 (h)). This waiver will be used principally in connection with interpreter services obtained by contract from foreign governments.

(2) The Government agencies concerned—principally the International Cooperation Administration—will be authorized to amend certain contracts with nonprofit institutions without regard to the legal requirements of consideration (section 3). This change will facilitate the correction of inequities arising under long-term contracts with universities.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10784¹

SPECIFICATION OF LAWS FROM WHICH FUNCTIONS AUTHORIZED BY THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED, SHALL BE EXEMPT

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 533 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, 68 Stat. 860 (22 U. S. C. 1793), it is hereby determined that, to the extent hereinafter indicated, the performance of functions authorized by that act, as amended (including the performance of functions authorized by section 544 thereof), without regard to the laws specified in the lettered subdivisions of sections 1 and 2 of this order and without regard to consideration as specified in section 3 of this order will further the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended:

SECTION 1. With respect to functions authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1750 *et seq.*), except those exercised by the Department of Defense under authority of sections 521 and 524 of that act (22 U. S. C. 1781, 1784):

(a) The act of March 26, 1934, c. 90, 48 Stat. 500, as amended (15 U. S. C. 616a).

(b) Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, 60 Stat. 809 (31 U. S. C. 529).

(c) Section 305 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, c. 288, 63 Stat. 396, as amended (41 U. S. C. 255).

(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5).

(e) Section 3710 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 8).

(f) Section 2 of Title III of the act of March 3, 1933, c. 212, 47 Stat. 1520 (41 U. S. C. 10a).

(g) Section 3735 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 13).

(h) Section 304 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as added by the act of October 31, 1951, c. 652, 65 Stat. 700 (41 U. S. C. 254 (c)), but only with respect to contracts entered into with foreign governments or agencies thereof for the rendering of

¹ 23 Fed. Reg. 7691.

services to the United States or an agency thereof within the continental limits of the United States.

(1) Section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, c. 858, 49 Stat. 2015, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1241 (a)).

SEC. 2. With respect to purchases authorized to be made outside the continental limits of the United States under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended:

(a) Section 2276 (a) of title 10 of the United States Code.

(b) Section 2313 (b) of title 10 of the United States Code.

(c) Section 304 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as added by the act of October 31, 1951, c. 652, 65 Stat. 700 (41 U. S. C. 254 (c)).

(d) Section 1301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, c. 199, 56 Stat. 185 (50 U. S. C. App. 643), as extended by the provisions of the act of June 30, 1953, c. 169, 67 Stat. 120.

SEC. 3. With respect to cost-type contracts heretofore or hereafter made under authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, with non-profit institutions under which no fee is charged or paid, amendments and modifications of such contracts may be made with or without consideration and may be utilized to accomplish the same things as any original contract could have accomplished, irrespective of the time or circumstances of the making, or the form of the contract amended or modified, or of the amending or modifying contract, and irrespective of rights which may have accrued under the contract or the amendments or modifications thereof.

This order supersedes Executive Order No. 10519 of March 5, 1954 (3 CFR, 1954 Supp., p. 48),² entitled "Specifications of Laws from Which Functions Authorized by Mutual Security Act of 1951, as Amended, Shall Be Exempt."

Dwight D. Eisenhower

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 1, 1958.

Japanese Trade Mission Visits United States

Press release 603 dated October 10

The Japanese Trade Mission headed by Heitaro Inagaki, president of the Japan Foreign Trade Council, Inc., arrived at Washington October 9 for a 6-week tour of the United States, which will take its members to New York, Providence, Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, New Orleans, Dallas, Los Angeles, Portland, San Francisco, and Seattle.

² BULLETIN of Mar. 29, 1954, p. 481.

The mission consists of 11 Japanese businessmen representing various branches of Japanese industry and commerce and two Government officials representing the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of International Trade and Industry. The leader of the mission, Mr. Inagaki, is a former Minister of International Trade and Industry.

The program of the mission's 6-day visit at Washington, which opened with a call on the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Thomas C. Mann, on October 10, includes calls at the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Export-Import Bank. Assistant Secretary Mann held a reception in honor of the mission at the President's Guest House on October 10.

A conference at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, followed by a luncheon of the Japan-America Society of Washington, will conclude the program of the mission's visit to Washington on October 15.

The Japanese Trade Mission has come to the United States in response to an invitation issued by the U.S. Trade Mission which visited Japan last spring. The Japanese Trade Mission to the United States has the same purpose as previous U.S. Trade Missions to Japan, namely, to promote good will and trade between the two nations.

Ghana To Receive American Corn To Combat Food Shortage

Press release 594 dated October 8

An agreement to supply \$650,000 worth of yellow-dent corn to Ghana under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (P. L. 480) was signed on October 8 by the Governments of the United States and Ghana. The agreement was signed for Ghana by R. M. Akwei, second secretary of the Embassy of Ghana, at the office of Stuart H. Van Dyke, regional director of the International Cooperation Administration.

The agreement under title II of P. L. 480 will permit the early shipment of the 5,000 tons of corn to Ghana, where it will be used to combat food shortages which have developed as a result of extremely dry weather conditions in the areas of South Mamprusi, Nanumba, Dagomba, and Gonja, which have a population of about 400,000.

U. N. Committee Agrees on Procedure for Disarmament Items

*Statements by Henry Cabot Lodge
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly*

STATEMENT OF OCTOBER 8¹

The United States is glad that the Soviet Union considers that the disarmament question as a whole should be considered first in this committee, although we disagree with the Soviet proposal that the item on the discontinuance of tests should be put ahead of the other disarmament items. Let me say that this is an unusual procedure; it is distinctly out of the ordinary. The usual practice is to take these items in the order in which they have been introduced. In the total list of agenda items for the 13th regular session of the General Assembly the question of disarmament appears as item 64; the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests is item 70; and the question of the reduction of the military budgets of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France is item 72. And of course this is reflected in document A/C.1/806,² in which disarmament is item 4, the discontinuance of tests item 7, and the reduction of military budgets item 8. Naturally, the question of the discontinuance of tests is going to be discussed here. The procedure which we propose, which is to discuss these items as a group, will permit the Soviet representative to deal with the discontinuance of tests first if he wishes to do so, and it will enable any other member of the committee to discuss that item first if he so desires. But we think that testing is only one part of the many complex issues involved in disarmament, and by no means the most dangerous. Action on it alone would not bring us closer to our goal of universal disarmament under effective control.

¹ Made in Committee I (Political and Security) (U.S. delegation press release 3010).

² "Allocation of agenda items to the First Committee."

All that we are proposing is that we should proceed here in a way that would permit each one of us to deal with the subject of disarmament in the way which he believes would be the most constructive. We do not think that any one member should seek to impose its way of discussing the subject on other members. Let each member choose for itself how it wants to discuss this question and the three items that make up the total disarmament problem.

I say in passing that, of course, I reject the Soviet representative's insinuation that those who do not agree with him are not interested in prompt results on disarmament. That kind of talk is very regrettable and certainly has no justification as far as the United States is concerned, because President Eisenhower has made it abundantly clear how anxious we are to obtain an agreement for the suspension of tests.

We think that the First Committee not only should take up disarmament as the first item of business—that is, items 4, 7, and 8 of our agenda, all of which relate directly to disarmament—but that the committee should now decide to discuss these three items as a group in such a way that they can be discussed together, if a representative wishes to do so; or, if a representative wishes to discuss them separately in any order which he may desire, he can do so.

The procedure which we advocate follows past practices. I have looked up the precedents and I find that at the sixth session the First Committee discussed simultaneously agenda item 1—regulation, limitation and reduction of all armed forces—and item 2—international control of atomic energy: report of the Committee of Twelve. I find that at the ninth session the First Committee considered simultaneously agenda item 1—regulation, limitation and the balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments: report of the Disarmament Commission—and agenda item 2—conclusion of an international convention on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass de-

struction. Thus, this is our usual way of doing things. Besides, it is a convenient way; it will promote orderly discussion. The three items are in themselves interrelated. Were we to consider each individually, we would waste valuable time by duplication of discussion.

Let me repeat: This does not prevent anyone from speaking on each item if he wishes to, or from covering all of them in a single statement if he so desires. It does not in any way prejudice what kind of action the committee may ultimately take. We already have before us two proposals on one item, and undoubtedly there will be others. The procedure which we propose will not exclude separate voting; there will be separate votes on each proposal should the committee decide to proceed in that way.

If the procedure which we suggest is adopted, each representative would be able to speak to any aspect of a question and there would be no need to change the order of the items that already appear on the agenda. We believe that the committee should not now decide on the order of the remaining items of the agenda but should content itself at this meeting with taking this decision on the disarmament contemplation as a whole.

[In a further intervention Mr. Lodge said:]

I will be guided by the desires of the committee as far as voting today or tomorrow is concerned.

I merely want to take one minute to say that the United States is anxious to have progress in this field. We see the possibility of progress in the talks to begin on October 31³ and on November 10.⁴ We therefore think that this committee should avoid three separate debates on disarmament, which we contend is what the Soviet proposal amounts to. We think that dealing with the three items—that is, item 4, item 7, and item 8—as part of one disarmament debate gives full scope for full debate without delay, and we hope that this will be the decision of the committee.

FIRST STATEMENT OF OCTOBER 9⁵

Let me first say that there is absolutely no foundation for the statements which have been made

³ For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 8, 1958, p. 378, and Sept. 29, 1958, p. 503.

⁴ For background, see p. 648.

⁵ Made in Committee I (Political and Security) (U.S. delegation press release 3011).

here today that the United States desires a new item, or that the United States desires to reword existing items, or that we are going to ask for a meeting of the General Committee. I really think I know what the United States proposal is and that I am in a better position to describe it than are those who have described it so erroneously.

The proposition of the United States, if adopted, would mean that the agenda of the First Committee will read as follows—I will read it out with all the punctuation marks, so that members can be perfectly clear as to what our proposal is:

1. Question of disarmament.
2. The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.
3. The reduction of the military budgets of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and France by 10-15 percent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries.

That is how the agenda of the committee would read if our proposal were adopted.

We think that these three items would be considered together. Each representative could deal with them as he saw fit. He can discuss them separately. He could take them up in any order he wished. He could talk about all three in one speech.

It is obvious that these three items are interrelated. All of them deal with different aspects of disarmament. We think that the most practical and most efficient way to deal with them is in the way that I have proposed. It does not prejudice in any way the committee's eventual decision on the result of our discussions.

Now, as far as the question raised by the representatives of Mexico and of Panama is concerned—and I understand they did not make motions, they raised questions—we think this: that the committee should decide at the time in what order it wishes to take up specific resolutions.

Now, we could not decide today in what order to take up resolutions if we wanted to because we do not know what all the resolutions are. Two resolutions are pending, but I know of one that has not been introduced yet and will be introduced. And I have heard rumors of several others.

So it is, of course, an absolute practical impossibility for us to decide here this afternoon in what order we are going to take up the resolutions

when we end our general debate. The only time we can make that decision is after the general debate is over, and then we can decide it in the light of the debate—which we hope will lead to some enlightenment—and in the light of the resolutions which are before us at the time.

I do not think we can say now that when the general debate is over we are going to limit ourselves to resolutions which correspond exactly with the limits of each agenda item. It seems to me that, if a member wants to introduce a resolution which deals with subjects that are included in various agenda items, he has got a right to do it. That happens here all the time. To seek to limit the discussion in that way would, we think, be self-defeating.

We do not think that the question of tests should be singled out and put first either today or after the general debate is over. We say that because we think tests are part of the whole contemplation and also because we do not think that tests are by any means the most dangerous aspect of this whole question. Furthermore, we do not think that the decision to put tests first can be accurately called a procedural motion.

It follows from what I have said, therefore, Mr. President, that we would be agreeable to your proposal No. 1—your compromise proposal No. 1—which would have a general debate on these three items together and then leave for a later stage the question of how we will deal with the resolutions. We think that is a good compromise and we would support that.

SECOND STATEMENT OF OCTOBER 9^{*}

Certain remarks that have been made lead me to ask the indulgence of the committee for just one minute to say that the United States wants to move ahead on this whole subject. We are getting our hopes up about Geneva because it is the first sign of progress on the cessation of tests. In fact, it is the indispensable first step.

Let me tell the committee that we hope to introduce a resolution with a number of other co-sponsors very soon which will clearly show to all the world the importance which we attach to this first step.

^{*}Made in Committee I (Political and Security) (U.S. delegation press release 3012).

We think that we here in this committee have the opportunity to do something that bids fair to get some real results on this matter of cessation of nuclear tests, and that is the spirit which animates us.⁷

International Cooperation In Field of Atomic Energy

by John A. McCone

Chairman, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission¹

Mr. President [Tjondronegoro Sudjarwo of Indonesia], my delegation wishes to thank you for assuming the tasks of presiding at this meeting and to congratulate you on your skillful handling of the problems that have arisen. I personally feel that as you attend international conferences of various kinds in the future you will find yourself, because of your knowledge of procedure, sitting in an elevated chair and, therefore, unable to enjoy the flexibility and latitude of other delegates.

It is a great honor to represent my country at this General Conference and to participate in its deliberations. We hope our work here will lead to the adoption of policies which will enable the Agency to progress more rapidly toward a realization of the basic objective stated in its charter, and that is: "to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world."

What is said and done at this conference may well determine the future of the Agency as a significant force in the field of the peaceful application of nuclear energy.

I deeply believe in this Agency—in its purpose, its hopes, and in its expectations. More important than my personal views, however, are those of my Government.

States stands firm in its support and resolute in

I can assure this conference that the United States stands firm in its conviction that the Agency offers to men of good will throughout the world a response to the

⁷Committee I on Oct. 9 adopted the procedure advocated by the United States by a vote of 50 to 9 (Soviet bloc), with 19 abstentions.

¹Remarks made at the 2d General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna on Sept. 25. Mr. McCone was chairman of the U.S. delegation.

challenge "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

The United States is prepared to exert all possible effort to maintain the Agency as the organization of primary importance in the field of international cooperation. This means that we will both initiate and we will support programs designed to strengthen and to advance the Agency as the preeminent international body in its field of competence.

As time and experience progress, and consistent with our existing obligations, the United States will look to the Agency as the major institutional channel through which international peaceful-use programs of the United States will be carried forward.

Basis for Cooperative Programs

The recently concluded United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy demonstrated the importance of international cooperation. The great wealth of technological material on civilian applications of the atom presented at Geneva provides a basis for specific programs which this Agency is uniquely qualified to undertake.

The United States welcomes and endorses the statement by the Japanese delegate signifying the intention of his Government to request this Agency to administer the safeguards provided in the agreement for cooperation between the United States and Japan and to do this when the Agency is prepared to undertake this service.

The vigor and imagination with which Japan is developing a program for peaceful utilization of atomic energy indicates the speed with which the Agency must move in this area. This work must be put in hand at once if the Agency is to assume this function, which the Japanese Government and the U.S. Government in consultation intend to request. We therefore join wholeheartedly with the Japanese delegation in support of an immediate approach to this task on the part of the Secretariat.

We are convinced that in this new field there are many important matters which must be dealt with on an international basis. Such matters include the necessary development of universal standards and regulations relating to protection against hazards of radiation, the enactment of an

international convention to meet the problems of third-party liability, and the careful utilization of technical manpower. Only an international organization such as this Agency can meet these and other similar issues.

I would like to speak particularly to the question of third-party liability. It has been referred to by several of the speakers who addressed this conference yesterday. It is my opinion and the opinion of my delegation that these references are an order to the Director General to immediately institute necessary studies and proposals for action.

It seems to me, Mr. President, and to my Government, that this conference must make a frank and open appraisal of the problems before us. We must unite in a constructive effort to resolve them just as we united in September 1956 to forge the Agency statute.²

The Agency may not have met all hopes and aspirations, but then no promising youth ever does. The United States believes, however, that the record to date, considered fairly and in proper perspective, is indeed encouraging. The report of the Board of Governors gives evidence of substantive accomplishment greater, perhaps, than we had any right to expect. One needs only to recall some of the highlights given by our Director General, Mr. [W. Sterling] Cole, in his opening statement at this conference.

He indicated the Agency's fellowship program is now in operation. Procedures for the dissemination of information have been devised. Technical experts have been made available for consultation, and field missions have been completed. A manual relating to protection against hazards of radiation has been drafted. The inevitable difficulties of initial organization have been met. We have before us for approval several agreements with other international organizations which provide for pooling many different talents to promote the uses of nuclear energy.

In spite of this very substantial progress, however, we must recognize that there remain major problems of organization and of substance which the Agency must face. These must be overcome if we are to achieve the objectives set forth in our charter, and it is the responsibility of all here to contribute to the solution of these problems.

² For background on the establishment of the IAEA and text of the statute, see BULLETIN of Nov. 19, 1956, p. 813.

With respect to substantive matters, the United States recognizes the collective responsibility that it shares with other atomically advanced nations to provide initiative and leadership in the development of concrete proposals for long-term Agency activity. We accept our share of this responsibility. We are prepared to submit certain suggestions to that end and emphasize that others must do likewise.

The United States does not consider this conference of member states merely a forum. Nor is this meeting limited only to a consideration of immediate activities proposed by our Board of Governors. This is a conference where the widespread exchange of views can become the source of fresh ideas from which the Board and the Director General can develop a full range of future activities. I note that many of the speakers have expressed similar ideas. These statements in their composite will, in the opinion of my delegation, serve as useful guidance to our Board and to the Director General of our Agency.

At the outset, I wish to state that my Government unequivocally supports the budget for next year's operations as proposed to the conference by the Board of Governors.

The United States attaches paramount importance to the funds recommended for Agency fellowships and for grant-in-aid assistance. The need for training in the nuclear field is universally recognized; and it is obvious that trained men require appropriate facilities with which to apply and develop the knowledge they have acquired.

We also support the provision for a central laboratory facility as we feel that the existence of such a laboratory is necessary. There can be no reasonable doubt in our opinion with respect to the necessity for permanent laboratory facilities placed at the Agency's exclusive responsibility and disposal.

U.S. Makes Six Proposals

In addition to the program outlined in the budget, my Government has given careful consideration to other desirable Agency activities. Accordingly, I should like to place before this conference six proposals. In some cases these involve new activities not incorporated in the budget; in other cases we are suggesting increased emphasis on activities already under way or planned.

1. *Radioisotopes.* The Agency as a major endeavor should inaugurate a program of training, research, and application in the field of radioisotopes. This program should have as its major emphasis applications of radioisotopes in the fields of medicine, biology, and agriculture.

The benefits of radioisotopes are available to us today. We do not need to await the development of more advanced or more efficient techniques although we confidently expect that such advances will extend the already impressive catalog of uses of the radioisotope. Further, medical, biological, and agricultural uses are immediately applicable to many of the problems of the less developed areas.

We emphasize particularly the contributions that the radioisotope can make to alleviate the crushing burden of hunger that is a primary problem in many parts of the world.

The Agency, through its fellowship plans, its equipment grant arrangements, and with the aid of its mobile radioisotope laboratories, can embark on a coordinated program for establishing radioisotope training and research centers in many member states. We urge that this area be pursued energetically.

My Government is prepared to cooperate directly with this effort through joint sponsorship with the Agency of specialized symposia, seminars, and short training courses in specific fields of isotope application. Our own training facilities in our country, in our laboratories and our research centers, remain open to students from foreign lands as they have in the past.

2. *Safety.* We urge that the Agency intensify efforts to develop international standards and regulations for the safe transportation, handling, and use of radioactive materials and the disposal of radioactive wastes. The Agency should also press forward with safety codes relating to reactor operation, reactor siting, and the protection of workers at atomic energy establishments.

Procedures for the accountability of material and a convention covering third-party liability are other important matters which should receive intense and early attention of the International Agency. Since common measuring devices are essential, steps should be taken also to establish the Agency as the central authority for the standardization of isotopes and instrument calibration.

3. *Training.* All of us recognize the absolute need of training scientists from those nations which are as yet but on the threshold of this new era. In the deep conviction that the inherent powers of the atom for good must be shared by all nations of good will, my Government urges most strongly that steps be taken beyond the planned fellowship programs. The Agency should be a central coordinating body for the training of personnel in these areas.

4. *Research.* We believe that there exists throughout the world today a wealth of scientific and technical competence which is not being brought fully to bear on the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We believe that the Agency can draw upon this unused talent to the benefit of all.

Accordingly, we are prepared to explore with the Agency the development of a program whereby specific research projects can be assigned by the United States Government to this Agency. The Agency, in turn, could develop contracts with existing research centers and universities throughout the world to perform the specific projects assigned to them.

As examples, we have in mind areas of research relating to ceramic fuel elements, to high-temperature metallurgy, to the study of metabolic processes of the human body, and the methodology of using radioisotopes in agriculture. In this way we may bring within the program additional talents not now available. My Government will bear all the contract costs involved, and, may I emphasize, the results of projects undertaken would be made available through the Agency to all member states.

We are offering to bear the costs of these contracts because we recognize that the Agency does not include funds in this year's budget for this purpose and because we believe these activities should be undertaken promptly. We are hopeful that, in due course, the results of this offer will encourage other participating governments to follow a similar course.

5. *Nuclear Power.* The Geneva conference—and particularly the opening address of its President, M. [Francis] Perrin—did much to place this subject in proper perspective.

There is no doubt but that nuclear power will be a significant economic factor in the world—in some countries sooner than in others. However,

we have come to that sophisticated stage in the development when we now know that, before economic nuclear power can become a widespread reality, many financial, scientific, and engineering problems must be solved. Of particular importance are problems of physics and metallurgy.

Today we have the technology to produce nuclear power. However, in many instances costs are substantially greater than conventional power. That, I might say, is the current condition. However, if we look down the road to the further development of nuclear power and to the long-range availability of other fuels, we can see that it is crystal clear that nuclear power will have its very important place in the industrial development of this world.

We therefore urge that the member states not be discouraged by the facts that control the immediate future but look a little longer down the road because it is our opinion that the long-range problem cannot be solved by our country or by any other country unless we come to grips with the whole technology and do so in the immediate future.

Even though there is some apparent higher cost of nuclear power as compared to other sources of power available at this time, this will not always be the case. We have to take a longer-range view than tomorrow, or a year from now, or even 5 years from now, for we must plan this on a 50-year basis.

The Agency should encourage the development of atomic power with due consideration to the special needs and conditions—particularly the timing of projects—of undeveloped areas of the world. Obviously, guidance is necessary in promoting a concentration of effort, a pooling of talents and resources, and encouraging a cooperative effort.

One important Agency function will be to assure the distribution and use of fuel for power reactors under conditions providing for their safe handling and accountability. In this connection the suggestion of the Director General for all shipments of source materials to be registered with this Agency should be carefully studied.

Research and development achievements are already impressive when viewed in the aggregate. The Agency can render a valuable service to its member states by making available to them, on a continuing basis, the results of current research

and development programs and by undertaking programs which form the basis for intelligent future planning. The Geneva conference did much to accomplish this. Further frequent meetings and exchanges should be planned by this Agency.

My country therefore proposes the following as an essential and immediate first step: the Agency undertake an intensive and continuing study and survey of existing reactor types, their costs, the criteria for the introduction of them into new areas, and means by which the Agency could accelerate the availability of nuclear power within reasonable economic dimensions.

We believe also that the Agency should be directed by this conference to formulate, for presentation at our next meeting, a coordinated long-range program for Agency assistance in the development and acquisition of nuclear-power facilities by member states. Additional emphasis might well be given to the development of smaller power-reactor designs suited to areas of more limited demand.

6. *Information Exchange.* The Agency should continue to develop into a major center for the acquisition, collection, and the distribution of scientific information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This will require the Agency to tap existing extensive sources of technical information. It should assemble and prepare these data in readily accessible form and encourage member states to avail themselves of this service. My Government will continue to forward to the Agency the immense volume of data being produced in our country.

We hope that the Agency will undertake the sponsorship of scientific conferences and symposia to make the most effective use of knowledge gained at Geneva and available here and elsewhere. This is an opportunity which the Agency should pursue with vigor and imagination.

Futhermore, the United States considers the future conferences of a type just concluded in Geneva should be undertaken under the auspices of this Agency.

More specifically, in the field of controlled thermonuclear fusion the United States proposes that the Agency undertake to serve as the medium through which its members engaged in controlled fusion research freely exchange technical information. This is, of course, an extension of the constructive cooperation which prevailed at the meeting earlier this month in Geneva. I can as-

sure you of the full cooperation of my Government.

Premise of U.S. Proposals

Mr. President, the program that my Government is suggesting is based on two factors: the sober recognition of the state of nuclear science and technology as it exists today, and the knowledge that the resources of this Agency are unfortunately limited.

My Government believes that to propose major program expenditures at this time would disrupt orderly progress. We feel it would impede rather than promote the attainment of the Agency's statutory objectives. We believe that the suggested program is soundly conceived and embraces projects of practical assistance to all of the Agency members, large and small.

I sincerely believe, Mr. President, that, if during the coming year the program outlined in the budget is implemented as planned and if further realistic projects such as those previously outlined are accepted, the International Atomic Energy Agency will have made firm and significant strides toward its goals.

President Eisenhower in his historic address before the United Nations in 1953 envisaged the International Atomic Energy Agency as a symbol which would "allow all peoples of all nations to see that . . . the great powers of the earth . . . are interested in human aspirations first, rather than in building up the armaments of war."

To promote the attainment of this objective the United States reaffirmed its offer of 5,000 kilograms of uranium U-235 for use by this Agency. Also we reaffirm that we will continue to match, quantity by quantity, until July 1, 1960, the offers of all other member states. We believe that it is not unrealistic to hope that such steps, coupled with appropriate progress in disarmament, will bring closer the day when the International Atomic Energy Agency will be the principal custodian of the world's fissionable material.

The Agency is now only at the threshold of its destiny. Before it lies the great challenge of realizing to the fullest extent the benefits of the atom. If we move forward wisely, the world will be infinitely richer. The example we set of international cooperation toward this common end might lead us in turn to the lasting peace all mankind seeks.

Robert McKinney Resigns as U.S. Representative to IAEA

The President on October 3 accepted the resignation of Robert McKinney as U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency effective October 4, following conclusion of the second General Conference of the IAEA meeting at Vienna.

Arnie J. Suomela Appointed to Fisheries Commission

The White House on October 9 announced the appointment by the President of Arnie J. Suomela to be a Commissioner of the U.S. Section of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, vice Ross L. Leffler, resigned.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

Security Council

Letter Dated 15 August 1958 From the Permanent Representative of India Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4086. August 18, 1958. 2 pp. mimeo.

Letter Dated 18 August 1958 From the Permanent Representative of India Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4088. August 19, 1958. 2 pp. mimeo.

Report of the Conference of Experts To Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests. Note by the Secretary-General. S/4091. August 28, 1958. 3 pp. mimeo.

Letter Dated 27 August 1958 From the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan Addressed to the President of the Security Council. S/4092. August 28, 1958. 8 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Committee on Industry and Natural Resources. Official records, 10th session, 24 February-3 March 1958. E/CN.11/INR/8. June 4, 1958. 100 pp. mimeo.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Inland Transport Committee. Official records, 7th session, 11-18 February 1958. E/CN.11/TRANS/135. 77 pp. mimeo.

Annual Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. E/3138. June 18, 1958. 100 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

Report of the World Health Organization. Supplementary Report. E/3106/Add. 1. June 26, 1958. 16 pp. mimeo.

TREATY INFORMATION

Venezuela and United States Sign Nuclear Power Agreement

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State (press release 591) announced on October 8 that the Governments of Venezuela and the United States had on that day signed a comprehensive agreement for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy for power and research.

Signing the agreement for the United States were Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., and John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for Venezuela Ambassador Marcos Falcón-Briceño.

The new agreement will broaden the scope of exchange with Venezuela by providing for cooperation on the development, design, construction, and operation of both power and research reactors. Under the terms of the agreement, which runs for 20 years, the Atomic Energy Commission will sell or lease fuel to Venezuela for use in research reactors and sell fuel for use in power reactors, providing a maximum of 800 kilograms of contained uranium 235 up to 20 percent enrichment. This fuel is allocated for use in a research reactor now under construction near Caracas, a materials-testing reactor, and three 15,000-kilowatt (electrical) boiling-water power reactors planned for future construction in Venezuela. In the case of the materials-testing reactor, the United States is authorized to provide a maximum of six kilograms of fuel at 90 percent enrichment in U-235.

The agreement will become effective after procedural requirements on the part of both Governments have been satisfied. It will supersede a research agreement for cooperation with Venezuela which has been in effect since July 21, 1955.¹

¹ Treaties and Other International Acts Series 3323.

U.S. and Japan Sign Protocol to Atomic Energy Agreement

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Department of State and the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced on October 9 (press release 598) that the Governments of Japan and the United States had on that day signed a protocol amending the agreement for cooperation between the two countries concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy signed June 16, 1958.¹ The Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission signed the protocol for the United States and the Ambassador of Japan signed for Japan.

Under the agreement for cooperation signed in June, the United States will make available as needed over a term of 10 years a net amount of 2,700 kilograms of uranium 235 to be contained in fuel sold or leased to Japan for use in research, experimental and demonstration power, and power reactors.

The amendment increases by 250 grams the quantity of plutonium which Japan may obtain for use in connection with defined research projects. It is anticipated that the increased quantity will be used principally to provide plutonium-beryllium sources for subcritical assemblies which are used for training and research in the field of reactor physics.

This protocol provides for the transfer of highly enriched uranium for use as fuel in research and materials-testing reactors where use of such material is technically and economically justified and the core loading does not exceed 8 kilograms.

The protocol further provides that byproduct special nuclear material produced in Japanese reactors fueled with U.S. materials, when it is purchased by the United States under the purchase option, as provided in article VII of the agreement, will be used only for peaceful purposes. This provision affirms U.S. policy concerning the use of such material as announced by the President on November 17, 1956.²

The agreement and the protocol will go into effect when the statutory and constitutional requirements of the two nations have been fulfilled.

¹ BULLETIN of July 7, 1958, p. 40.

² *Ibid.*, Dec. 10, 1956, p. 926.

TEXT OF PROTOCOL

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan;

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on June 16, 1958, hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation";

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article V paragraph A, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "10 grams of U-233, 250 grams of plutonium in the form of fabricated foils and sources, and 10 grams of plutonium in other forms".

ARTICLE II

Article VII, paragraph C, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"C. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as material enriched up to ninety per cent (90%) for use in research and materials testing reactors, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium."

ARTICLE III

Article VII, paragraph F, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by inserting the phrase "for use for peaceful purposes only" immediately after the phrase "a first option to purchase".

ARTICLE IV

This Protocol shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Protocol and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Protocol.

DONE at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, both texts being equally authentic, this Ninth day of October, 1958.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER S. ROBERTSON

JOHN McCONE

For the Government of Japan:

KOICHIRO ASAKAI
Ambassador of Japan

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Automotive Traffic

Convention on road traffic, with annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Accession deposited: Malaya (excluding annexes 1 and 2), September 10, 1958.

International Court of Justice

Statute of the International Court of Justice (59 Stat. 1055).

Declaration recognizing compulsory jurisdiction deposited: Japan, September 15, 1958.¹ Effective for 5 years from September 15, 1958, and thereafter until terminated by written notice.

Law of the Sea

Convention on the territorial sea and the contiguous zone; Convention on the high seas;

Convention on fishing and conservation of living resources of the high seas;

Convention on the continental shelf.

Done at Geneva April 29, 1958.²

Signature: Ireland, October 2, 1958.

Safety at Sea

Convention on safety of life at sea. Signed at London June 10, 1948. Entered into force November 19, 1952. TIAS 2495.

Acceptance deposited: Ghana, November 22, 1957.

Regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Done at London June 10, 1948. Entered into force January 1, 1954. TIAS 2899.

Acceptance deposited: Ghana, July 10, 1958.

Shipping

International load line convention. Signed at London July 5, 1930. Entered into force January 1, 1933. 47 Stat. 2228.

Accession deposited: Ghana, November 22, 1957.

BILATERAL

Federation of Malaya

Agreement relating to the sale of military equipment, materials, and services to the Federation of Malaya. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington June 30 and July 9, 1958. Entered into force July 9, 1958.

Ghana

Agreement relating to investment guaranties under section 413 (b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 832, 847; 22 U. S. C. 1933). Effected by exchange of notes at Accra September 30, 1958. Entered into force September 30, 1958.

Japan

Protocol amending research and power reactor agreement concerning civil uses of atomic energy of June 16, 1958.² Signed at Washington October 9, 1958. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

Venezuela

Research and power reactor agreement concerning civil uses of atomic energy, and superseding research reactor agreement of July 21, 1955 (TIAS 3323). Signed at

¹ With conditions.

² Not in force.

Washington October 8, 1958. Enters into force on date on which each Government receives from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Secretary Dulles Inaugurates Senior Officer Course at FSI

Press release 547 dated September 22

Secretary Dulles on September 22 officially inaugurated a new advanced course for senior officers of the Department of State at the Foreign Service Institute.

The senior officer course represents a further step by the Department to carry out recommendations for improving the training of career Foreign Service officers made in 1954 by the Public Committee on State Department Personnel, chaired by Henry Winston, then president of Brown University. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs earlier had recommended that the Foreign Service Institute "provide adequate in-service training for Foreign Service Officers as well as for other officers and employees of the Service similar to that provided for Army and Navy officers in the command schools, and the Army and Navy War Colleges."

Inauguration of this course completes a cycle of specialized training provided for officers beginning at junior grade through midcareer on to the policy-making level.

The senior officer course will be the most advanced program in the field of international relations and foreign policy offered by the Department of State. Participation in the course this year is limited to 20 individuals comprising carefully selected senior officers of the Foreign Service, with a small number of spaces for officers of equivalent rank from those other agencies of the Government particularly involved in different aspects of U.S. foreign policy. The course will continue through June 1959.

The purpose of the course is to prepare officers for the highest positions of responsibility in policy recommendation and execution, coordina-

tion, planning, and administration in the Department, in diplomatic posts abroad, and in inter-agency and international organizations.

Harold B. Hoskins, director of the Foreign Service Institute, announced that the institute will call upon outstanding representatives of U.S. Government, industry, and labor as well as academic specialists to participate in directing seminar studies and discussions. Special library and other facilities have been installed at the institute to carry out the objectives of the senior officer program. The course is under the supervision of Willard F. Barber, a career Foreign Service officer of class one.

The course will include study of the following subjects: (1) the bases for American foreign policy; (2) domestic influences on U.S. foreign policy; (3) review of recent U.S. diplomacy; (4) foreign policy objectives of allied and neutral states and the Sino-Soviet bloc; (5) current foreign policy problems.

Recess Appointments

The President on October 10 appointed Lampton Berry to be Ambassador to Ceylon, vice Maxwell H. Gluck, resigned. (For biographic details, see press release 602 dated October 10.)

Designations

Rolland Welch as Special Assistant (Consular Affairs) to the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, effective October 5.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Visa Work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Pub. 6510. Department and Foreign Service Series 69. 80 pp. \$2.25.

This report is a résumé of visa procedures under the immigration acts which have been passed by Congress, as

well as statistical tables of visas issued and quotas established under the Immigration Act of 1924.

International Educational Exchange Program 1948-1958. Pub. 6647. International Information and Cultural Series 58. 66 pp. Limited distribution.

19th semiannual report to Congress containing selected highlights of exchange accomplishments during the last 10 years and a review of exchange activities from January to June 1957.

When You Go Abroad—Information for Bearers of Passports. Pub. 6665. Department and Foreign Service Series 78. 109 pp. 35¢.

This pamphlet, which is an informative guide to American citizens traveling abroad, points out general rules, regulations, and responsibilities of passport holders in foreign countries.

Fact Sheet on the Mutual Security Program. Pub. 6673. General Foreign Policy Series 129. 6 pp. Limited distribution.

A folder explaining the need for a mutual security program.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: October 6-12

Press releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Releases issued prior to October 6 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 547 of September 22, 576 of October 1, and 578 of October 2.

No.	Date	Subject
†584	10/6	General War Sequel Law of German Federal Republic.
585	10/6	Herter: Chinese Communist cease-fire.
*586	10/7	Educational exchange (Italy).
587	10/7	Note to U.S.S.R. on crashed U.S. plane.
588	10/8	Finland credentials (rewrite).
589	10/8	Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Lebanon.
590	10/8	Satterthwaite: "The United States and Africa: Challenge and Opportunity."
591	10/8	Atomic energy agreement with Venezuela.
*592	10/8	Educational exchange (U.S.).
593	10/8	Convoy activities in Taiwan area.
594	10/8	Agricultural surpluses to Ghana.
595	10/9	Rubottom: "Components of Inter-American Understanding."
†596	10/9	Delegation to GATT (rewrite).
*597	10/9	Dulles: message on death of Pope.
598	10/9	Protocol amending atomic energy agreement with Japan.
†599	10/9	U.S.-U.S.S.R. agreement on cinematography.
600	10/10	Note to U.S.S.R. on surprise attack.
601	10/10	Salk vaccine to Poland.
*602	10/10	Recess appointment of Berry as ambassador to Ceylon (biographic details).
603	10/10	Visit of Japanese trade mission.
*604	10/11	Educational exchange (Poland).
605	10/11	Military survey team to Jordan.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Africa. The United States and Africa: Challenge and Opportunity (Satterthwaite)	641	Lebanon. U.S. Announces Withdrawal of Forces From Lebanon	650
American Republics. Components of Inter-American Understanding (Rubottom)	654	Middle East. Developing Universal Respect for the Rule of Law (Murphy)	651
Atomic Energy		Military Affairs	
International Cooperation in Field of Atomic Energy (McCone)	668	Military Survey Team Sent to Jordan	651
Robert McKinney Resigns as U.S. Representative to IAEA	673	U.S. Announces Withdrawal of Forces From Lebanon	650
U.S. and Japan Sign Protocol to Atomic Energy Agreement	674	U.S. Seeks Further Information From U.S.S.R. on Crashed Plane (text of U.S. note)	659
Venezuela and United States Sign Nuclear Power Agreement	673	Mutual Security	
Brazil. World Bank Makes Loan in Brazil for Hydroelectric Project	663	Exemption of Functions Under Mutual Security Act (text of Executive order)	664
Ceylon. Berry appointed ambassador	676	Ghana To Receive American Corn To Combat Food Shortage	665
China		Poland	
Developing Universal Respect for the Rule of Law (Murphy)	651	General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1958 (text of proclamation)	658
U.S. Views on Communist Cease-Fire in Taiwan Straits Area (Dulles, Herter)	650	U.S. Sells Antipolio Vaccine to Poland	659
Czechoslovakia. U.S. Replies to Czechoslovak Protest on Border Violations (texts of U.S. and Czechoslovak notes)	660	Presidential Documents	
Department and Foreign Service		Exemption of Functions Under Mutual Security Act	664
Designations (Welch)	676	General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1958	658
Recess Appointments (Berry)	676	Protection of Nationals. U.S. Replies to Czechoslovak Protest on Border Violations (texts of U.S. and Czechoslovak notes)	660
Secretary Dulles Inaugurates Senior Officer Course at FSI	675	Publications. Recent releases	676
Disarmament		Treaty Information	
Date Set for Technical Talks on Preventing Surprise Attack (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)	648	Current Actions	675
U.N. Committee Agrees on Procedure for Disarmament Items (Lodge)	666	U.S. and Japan Sign Protocol to Atomic Energy Agreement	674
Economic Affairs		Venezuela and United States Sign Nuclear Power Agreement	673
Arnie J. Suomela Appointed to Fisheries Commission	673	U.S.S.R.	
Components of Inter-American Understanding (Rubottom)	654	Date Set for Technical Talks on Preventing Surprise Attack (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)	648
Japanese Trade Mission Visits United States	665	U.S. Seeks Further Information From U.S.S.R. on Crashed Plane (text of U.S. note)	659
World Bank Makes Loan in Brazil for Hydroelectric Project	663	United Nations	
Finland. Letters of Credence (Seppala)	653	Current U.N. Documents	673
Ghana. Ghana To Receive American Corn To Combat Food Shortage	665	U.N. Committee Agrees on Procedure for Disarmament Items (Lodge)	666
International Law. Developing Universal Respect for the Rule of Law (Murphy)	651	Venezuela. Venezuela and United States Sign Nuclear Power Agreement	673
International Organizations and Conferences			
International Cooperation in Field of Atomic Energy (McCone)	668		
Robert McKinney Resigns as U.S. Representative to IAEA	673		
Japan			
Japanese Trade Mission Visits United States	665		
U.S. and Japan Sign Protocol to Atomic Energy Agreement	674		
Jordan. Military Survey Team Sent to Jordan	651		

Name Index

Berry, Lampton	676
Dulles, Secretary	650, 675
Eisenhower, President	658, 664
Herter, Christian A.	650
Lodge, Henry Cabot	666
McCone, John A.	668
McKinney, Robert	673
Murphy, Robert	651
Rubottom, Roy R., Jr.	654
Satterthwaite, Joseph C.	641
Seppala, Richard Rafael	653
Suomela, Arnie J.	673
Welch, Rolland	676

DSB-DEC
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
ATT STEVENS RICE
313 N FIRST ST
ANN ARBOR MICHIGAN



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

YOU . . .
and the UNITED NATIONS
1958-59

Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Representative to the United Nations, answers 24 questions frequently asked by citizens in this newly revised pamphlet on the functions and accomplishments of the U.N.

Among the questions:

"Can the United Nations do anything about disarmament?"

"How much does our membership in the United Nations cost?"

"What about outer space? Can the U.N. do anything to see that nations use outer space for peace instead of war?"

"How would you sum up the value of the United Nations to the United States?"

An introductory section outlines U.S. representation in the U.N. The 48-page pamphlet is illustrated.

Publication 6692

25 cents

For your convenience, the Order Form is printed below:

ADDRESS ORDER FORM TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS,
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
REMITTANCES, PAYABLE TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS,
SHOULD ACCOMPANY ORDERS.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed And:

\$
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me copies of *You . . . and the United Nations, 1958-59*

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State: